



Translated Texts for Historians

300–800 AD is the time of late antiquity and the early middle ages: the transformation of the classical world, the beginnings of Europe and of Islam, and the evolution of Byzantium. TTH makes available sources translated from Greek, Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Arabic, Georgian, Gothic and Armenian. Each volume provides an expert scholarly translation, with an introduction setting texts and authors in context, and with notes on content, interpretation and debates.

Editorial Committee

Phil Booth, Trinity College, Oxford

Sebastian Brock, Oriental Institute, University of Oxford

Averil Cameron, Keble College, Oxford

Marios Costambeys, University of Liverpool

Carlotta Dionisotti, King's College, London

Jill Harries, St Andrews

Peter Heather, King's College, London

Robert Hoyland, Oriental Institute, University of Oxford

William E. Klingshirn, The Catholic University of America

Michael Lapidge, Clare College, Cambridge

John Matthews, Yale University

Neil McLynn, Corpus Christi College, Oxford

Richard Price, Heythrop College, University of London

Claudia Rapp, Institut für Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik, Universität Wien

Judith Ryder, University of Oxford

Raymond Van Dam, University of Michigan

Michael Whitby, University of Birmingham

Ian Wood, University of Leeds

General Editors

Gillian Clark, University of Bristol

Mark Humphries, Swansea University

Mary Whitby, University of Oxford



VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



A full list of published titles in the Translated Texts for Historians series is available on request. The most recently published are shown below.

Three Political Voices from the Age of Justinian: Agapetus – Advice to the Emperor, Dialogue on Political Science, Paul the Silentary – Description of Hagia Sophia

Translated with notes and an introduction by PETER N. BELL

Volume 52: 249pp, ISBN 978-1-84631-209-0

History and Hagiography from the Late Antique Sinai

DANIEL F. CANER, with contributions by SEBASTIAN BROCK, RICHARD M. PRICE and KEVIN VAN BLADEL

Volume 53: 346pp, ISBN 978-1-84631-216-8

Orosius: Seven Books of History against the Pagans

Translated with introduction and notes by A. T. FEAR

Volume 54: 456pp., 2010; ISBN 978-1-84631-473-5 cased, 978-1-84631-239-7 limp

The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor: Church and War in Late Antiquity

Translated by GEOFFREY GREATREX, with ROBERT PHENIX and CORNELIA HORN; introductory material by SEBASTIAN BROCK and WITOLD WITAKOWSKI

Volume 55: 2010; ISBN 978-1-84631-493-3 cased, 978-1-84631-494-0 limp

Bede: On the Nature of Things and On Times

Translated with introduction and notes by CALVIN B. KENDALL and FAITH WALLIS

Volume 56: 371pp., 2010, ISBN 978-1-84631-495-7

Theophilus of Edessa's Chronicle

Translated with introduction and notes by ROBERT G. HOYLAND

Volume 57: 368pp., 2011, ISBN 978-1-84631-697-5 cased, 978-1-84631-698-2 limp

Bede: Commentary on Revelation

Translated with introduction and notes by FAITH WALLIS

Volume 58: 343pp., 2013, ISBN 978-1-84631-844-3 cased, 978-1-84631-845-0 limp

Two Early Lives of Severos, Patriarch of Antioch

Translated with an introduction and notes by SEBASTIAN BROCK and BRIAN FITZGERALD

Volume 59, 175pp., 2013, ISBN 978-1-84631-882-5 cased, 978-1-84631-883-2 limp

The Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom

Translated with an introduction and notes by TIMOTHY D. BARNES and GEORGE BEVAN

Volume 60, 193pp., ISBN 978-1-84631-887-0 cased, 978-1-84631-888-7 limp

For full details of Translated Texts for Historians, including prices and ordering information, please write to the following:

All countries, except the USA and Canada: Liverpool University Press, 4 Cambridge Street, Liverpool, L69 7ZU, UK (*Tel* +44-[0]151-794 2233, *Fax* +44-[0]151-794 2235, Email janmar@liv.ac.uk, <http://www.liverpooluniversitypress.co.uk>). **USA and Canada:** University of Chicago Press, 1427 E. 60th Street, Chicago, IL, 60637, US (*Tel* 773-702-7700, *Fax* 773-702-9756, www.press.uchicago.edu)





Translated Texts for Historians
Volume 61

The Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649

Translated with notes by
RICHARD PRICE

With contributions by
PHIL BOOTH and CATHERINE CUBITT

Liverpool
University
Press





First published 2014
Liverpool University Press
4 Cambridge Street
Liverpool, L69 7ZU

Copyright © 2014 Richard Price, Phil Booth and Catherine Cubitt

The right of Richard Price, Phil Booth and Catherine Cubitt to be identified as the authors of this book has been asserted by them in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A British Library CIP Record is available.

ISBN 978-1-78138-039-0 cased

Typeset by Carnegie Book Production, Lancaster
Printed by BooksFactory.co.uk





CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Abbreviations	xiii
Prologue: The Chalcedonian Inheritance	1
General Introduction	
I. Events before the Synod	5
II. Understanding the Crisis	18
1. The Constantinopolitan Perspective	18
2. The Palestinian Perspective	27
3. The Roman Perspective	40
III. The Acts, their Character and Purpose	59
IV. The Lateran Synod	69
1. The Course of the Synod	69
2. The Aftermath	77
V. The Theological Issues	87
VI. The Reception of the Synod	103
The Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649	
The First Session, 5 October	111
The Second Session, 8 October	132
The Third Session, 17 October	190
The Fourth Session, 19 October	237
The Fifth Session, 31 October	286
Letters of Pope Martin	389
Appendix: The Attendance and Subscription Lists	418
Maps	423





vi THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

Glossary 428

Bibliography 433

Indices

1. Documents and Citations in the Acts 452

2. Persons in the Acts 455

3. The Commentary 460





PREFACE

The Lateran Synod and the Monothelete Controversy

The Lateran Synod of 649 was a major event in the monothelete controversy of the seventh century. The traditional account of this controversy, still repeated today, runs as follows. In the early seventh century the Byzantine emperors sought to strengthen their rule, threatened by the Persian and then the Arab invasions, by repairing the schism between Chalcedonians (or dyophysites) and non-Chalcedonians (or miaphysites) that divided Christians in their dominions. With this end in view they promoted the doctrine of one ‘operation’ (or activity) and one will in Christ, even though this denied Christ a human will and was therefore irreconcilable to the authentic Chalcedonian teaching of two complete natures in Christ: divine and human. This doctrine, dear to miaphysites but novel for dyophysites, was forced on the patriarchs of Constantinople and most of the other bishops in the eastern provinces by imperial pressure. It was, however, resisted first in Palestine and then in Rome. In 649 Pope Martin I held a synod in the Lateran Basilica in Rome, attended by over a hundred bishops (very largely Italian) and also by a number of Greek monks, including the leading dyothelete theologian, Maximus the Confessor. At this synod the monothelete or one-will heresy was condemned and the authentic dyothelete doctrine (of two wills and operations in Christ) defined and affirmed. Both Martin and Maximus the Confessor were subsequently arrested and put on trial in Constantinople, where both were condemned on trumped up charges of treason, although the real reason for their condemnation was their adherence to orthodoxy. They were, however, vindicated at a subsequent ecumenical council, Constantinople III in 680–1, which condemned monotheletism and restored the authentic Chalcedonian faith.

Over the last two decades a number of scholars have demolished, one by one, the components of this edifying tale. The dust has not yet settled and some important details are still in dispute, but the following picture is in process of supplanting the traditional one. Monotheletism and





monoenergism (the doctrines of one will and one operation in Christ) were misrepresented by their opponents: monothelites and monoenergists did not deny Christ a human will or operation, but simply insisted that they were united to, and in harmony with, the divine will and operation, in such a way that it was proper to speak of one will and one operation, with both divine and human components. Their beliefs and formulae were not taken over from the miaphysites, but developed within the Chalcedonian tradition itself. The language of one operation was not imposed on the whole Church, but simply employed in the context of reconciliation, or attempted reconciliation, with the non-Chalcedonians. The dyotheletism of Pope Martin and Maximus the Confessor was not the main reason for their condemnation: the charges of rejection of imperial authority and of support given to unsuccessful usurpers were serious and well founded. The attempt by Martin to secure recognition of the Lateran Synod throughout the empire, and to replace monothelite bishops in Syria and Palestine by dyothelete ones appointed by his agents, will have been perceived in the east as grossly uncanonical. Constantinople III, while condemning the monoenergists and monothelites, did not rehabilitate Martin or Maximus, whose attempts to undermine the established order of church and state were still deplored. Both Martin and Maximus, it must be said, were motivated by a sincere anxiety over what they perceived as a novel heresy whose adoption in the empire had brought divine retribution in the shape of the Arab conquests. But at the time they were more generally perceived as troublemakers who were dividing Christendom at a time of crisis when unity and solidarity had never been more necessary.

Meanwhile, the history of the Lateran Synod has itself been rewritten. Its Acts exist in two editions, both going back to the time of the synod, one in Latin and one in Greek. Linguistic analysis that accompanied the production of the first critical edition of the Acts (that appeared in 1984) showed that, even though the synod must have conducted its business in Latin, and even though these Acts present the Greek text as a translation of the Latin, the reverse is the case: the Greek is the original, and the Latin (save in the case of a few inserted documents) is the translation. What did this mean for the procedure with which the synod conducted its business? And what does this mean for the relation between the synodal proceedings and the Acts? The answers to these questions are far from obvious, and scholars are not in agreement.

This is the context in which we have thought it timely to produce the first modern translation, and the first annotated edition, of the Acts of the





PREFACE

ix

Lateran Synod of 649. They have one further call on our attention. It has been shown that the Acts follow and express the theology of Maximus the Confessor, who was present at the synod and must surely have been himself the author (or at least have supervised the composition) of the intricate expositions of doctrine that the Acts contain. Our text will add to the still limited body of material available in English for the study of the writer who is widely held to have been the greatest of all Byzantine theologians. Whatever may be said of his role in the ecclesiastical politics of his time, his intellectual contribution to the understanding of will and operation in Christ towered above the work of both his predecessors and his contemporaries.

This edition

In view of the variety and range of these points of significance, study of the synod requires scholarly collaboration. The 'General Introduction' in this volume is the work of several hands. Sections I and II. 1–2 and the final section of IV ('Events before the Synod', 'The Constantinopolitan Perspective', 'The Palestinian Perspective', 'The fate of Maximus the Confessor') have been written by Phil Booth. Sections II. 3 and IV ('The Roman Perspective', 'The Lateran Synod, its Course and Aftermath') are the work of Catherine Cubitt (save for the final section of IV). The rest of the book is the work of Richard Price.

The translation follows the Greek version of the Acts edited by Riedinger and published in the *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, since Riedinger proved that this version and not the Latin version was the original one. I have, however, translated from the Latin text in the case of the documents inserted in the Acts that had been composed in Latin and are preserved in their original form in the Latin Acts. A footnote will inform the reader wherever the Latin version is followed.

Riedinger very rarely emends the Greek text preserved in our one authoritative manuscript. In my own translation I have made a number of small corrections. Where such correction was obvious and unimportant, I have not thought it necessary to annotate it.

As translator I would like to comment on the privilege it is to work with a text in late antique Greek. No one would read these Acts as a work of literature, but a translator becomes acutely aware of the elegance of Greek syntax and the comparative clumsiness of the English language. I have done my best to convey something of the rhetorical flow, and not simply the content, of the original text.





Texts and Studies

The 'original text' has its complexities. As already noted, the Acts of the Lateran Synod exist in two versions, Latin and Greek, both contemporary to the council. Our manuscript sources are few but adequate. For the full text of the Greek version we have a single independent manuscript, of which the others are but copies – *Codex Vaticanus graecus* 1455, dating to 1299; for the Latin version easily our best manuscript is the Laon codex (*Codex Laudunensis latinus* 199), dating to the ninth century. As for printed editions, the first was that of the Latin Acts by Surius in 1585, while both versions appeared in the great conciliar editions of Labbé (1671), Hardouin (1715) and Mansi (1764). However, for a properly critical edition of the texts, with details of the manuscripts consulted and an apparatus criticus, we had to wait until the edition by Rudolf Riedinger, published in 1984 as part of the series *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* (ACO), produced by the Bavarian Academy of Sciences and published by Walter de Gruyter (Berlin). This edition gives the Greek and Latin texts on opposite pages with a full apparatus criticus. Riedinger is scrupulously faithful to the manuscripts, perhaps excessively so, since many obvious errors are left uncorrected. It remains an impressive work of scholarship and the indispensable basis for study.

Almost as indispensable were the articles written by Riedinger and devoted to this text which appeared between 1976 and 1996; most of these were assembled in his *Kleine Schriften* of 1998. In 1989, in response to Riedinger's work, there appeared Pietro Conte's *Il Sinodo Lateranense dell' ottobre 649*, an excellent supplement to Riedinger's articles. This remains the only monograph devoted to the synod, but our picture of the participants in the synod, and of the monothelite controversy that provides its context, has been hugely enriched by a series of studies, listed in our bibliography, of which the following deserve special mention: Karl-Heinz Uthemann (1997), Wolfram Brandes (1998), Friedhelm Winkelmann (2001), Heinz Ohme (2006 and 2008a), Marek Jankowiak (2009), Phil Booth (2013a). The revised picture of the monothelite controversy that these authors provide forms the basis of the commentary in this volume, just as Riedinger does for the text.

The three contributors to this volume would like to draw special attention to the work of Marek Jankowiak. His Paris-Warsaw doctoral thesis of 2009, *Essai d'histoire politique du monothélisme*, marks a major advance in the understanding of every aspect and every stage of the





PREFACE

xi

monothelete controversy. All the contributors to this volume have learnt a great deal from his work, and eagerly await its publication in book form. In acknowledgement of our debt, this book is dedicated to him.







ABBREVIATIONS

ACO	Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum (original series)
ACO ²	Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum, Series Secunda
AHC	<i>Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum</i>
<i>Anal. Boll.</i>	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i>
<i>ByZ</i>	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i>
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis
CCSG	Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina
CFHB	Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae
<i>COCD</i>	<i>Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta</i>
CPG	Clavis Patrum Graecorum
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
DACL	Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie
DHGE	Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique
<i>EHR</i>	<i>English Historical Review</i>
<i>ep.</i>	<i>epistula</i>
<i>FilMed</i>	<i>Filologia mediolatina</i>
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte
<i>GRBS</i>	<i>Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies</i>
<i>JECS</i>	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
<i>JEH</i>	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
<i>JÖB</i>	<i>Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LSJ	Liddell/Scott/Jones, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> (Oxford 1940)
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
<i>OCP</i>	<i>Orientalis Christiana periodica</i>
<i>Opusc.</i>	<i>Opusculum</i>
<i>PBSR</i>	<i>Papers of the British School at Rome</i>
PG	Migne, <i>Patrologia Graeca</i>





xiv THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

PL	Migne, Patrologia Latina
PO	Patrologia Orientalis
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
<i>RBén</i>	<i>Revue bénédictine</i>
<i>RÉB</i>	<i>Revue des études Byzantines</i>
<i>RThL</i>	<i>Revue théologique de Louvain</i>
SC	Sources Chrétiennes
<i>StPat</i>	<i>Studia Patristica</i>
TTH	Translated Texts for Historians
ZAC	<i>Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum</i>
ZKG	<i>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte</i>





PROLOGUE: THE CHALCEDONIAN INHERITANCE

In the days, now receding into the past, when a study of Christian doctrine at university level would standardly cover its development in the early centuries, the stopping point was normally the Council of Chalcedon of 451, with its definition that Christ is ‘acknowledged in two natures’, divine and human, whose attributes ‘come together into one person and one hypostasis’ – in other words, to form one individual. We were told that this ‘solved’ the Christological problem, and is a rock and firm foundation on which later theology can build. But without a definition of what is meant by ‘nature’ and what by ‘hypostasis’ (for hitherto the two terms had generally been used as synonyms) the definition is too indefinite to be either true or false.

Whether the debates that followed Chalcedon for several centuries advanced the Church’s understanding of Christ or were a ‘Serbonian bog where armies whole have sunk’ (to borrow the words of Milton) is a matter we may leave to theologians. But the historian cannot but note that a council intended to reunite has divided Christendom ever since. It is true that the divisions have not been ubiquitous. The western churches, under the leadership of Rome, accepted Chalcedon without demur, and the papacy took particular satisfaction in the description (in the conciliar definition) of the Tome of Pope Leo as ‘a universal pillar against those with false beliefs’.

Those with false beliefs fell into two categories, on the two sides of the royal road of orthodoxy. On the one side were the ‘Nestorians’, accused of dividing Christ into two separate persons, even two distinct ‘Sons’ of God, related to each other but not one and the same. On the other side were the ‘Eutychians’ or ‘Apollinarians’, later called ‘monophysites’, who were accused of denying Christ a true human nature. If a Chalcedonian wanted to accuse a fellow Chalcedonian, he would charge him with having tumbled off the royal road into one or other of these ditches.

It was in the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire that Chalcedon





2 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

proved to many a rock of offence. By the time of Chalcedon Cyril of Alexandria enjoyed a unique status among writers on Christology. He had avoided a formal statement of 'two natures after the union', and his formula 'one incarnate nature' had been taken up by many of his followers (whence the modern term 'miaphysite'). It was only insistence by the Roman delegates (supported by the imperial officials who chaired the sessions) that secured the adoption of the 'in two natures' formula at Session V of Chalcedon, with its clear implication of a continuing duality in Christ. This is sometimes seen as a victory for the so-called 'Antiochene school' or even (posthumously) for Nestorius; but the eastern bishops were overwhelmingly Cyrillian, and this cannot have been their intention. This left the heirs of Chalcedon with the task of demonstrating against its critics that the definition was not Nestorian. The defenders of Chalcedon had to stress its Cyrillian elements, and the result was that the definition ceased to define a middle path that was genuinely equidistant from the two heretical extremes. This development of a 'Cyrillian Chalcedonianism' that gave the prime emphasis to unity in Christ received formal endorsement at the Second Council of Constantinople (553). Positively, the conciliar canons defined something that Chalcedon had failed to articulate unambiguously – that all the actions and operations of Christ's two natures are to be ascribed to God the Word as their personal subject (Canons 2 and 3). Negatively, they condemned the 'Three Chapters' – namely the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, for being Nestorian before Nestorius, and the attacks on Cyril written around the time of the Council of Ephesus (431) by two Syrian bishops, Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Ibas of Edessa.

The reaction of the west to these and similar developments was one of alarm, at times of outrage. For more than three centuries Pope Leo and his successors interpreted developments in the east as motivated by an improper desire to reunite with the anti-Chalcedonians. Limited in their ability to follow and judge these developments, the popes adopted the principle that any addition to Chalcedon implied that the work of Chalcedon was deficient and thereby derogated from its authority.

The argument was not without force as regards the 'Three Chapters' controversy, since two of the bishops censured in 553 – Theodoret and Ibas – had been restored to their sees by Chalcedon. A modern historian could say that Chalcedon had restored them without enthusiasm and for political reasons. But the notion that an ecumenical council was subject to such pressures was not acceptable. Instead it was argued that Chalcedon had accepted them back as penitents; but by the law of the church penitents





could be readmitted to communion but not restored to clerical status. Western resentment of the work of the council of 553 was consequently intense, and Pope Vigilius' reluctant confirmation of the councils' decrees could not but look like abject surrender.

This is the background to the seventh-century disputes over wills and operations in Christ. The favouring of the formulae 'one operation' or 'one will' in Christ, which we can trace back to the mid-sixth century, was yet another attempt by the Chalcedonians of the east to define their own position, and to prove, through a stress on unity in Christ, that they were not Nestorian. It was not primarily motivated by a desire to win back non-Chalcedonians to the imperial church, though this was a subsidiary aim at times. But to Roman eyes it was a deficient Chalcedonianism that made additions. In 634/5 Pope Honorius responded to the eastern debate by approving a Byzantine decree (the *Psēphos* of 633/4) that forbade the assertion of either one or two operations in Christ; for both assertions seemed to him improper novelties, since Chalcedon had not applied number to Christ's operations. At the same time, he affirmed oneness of will in Christ – not as a new formula, but as a self-evident truth arising from the perfect union between his Godhead and his manhood, as taught at Chalcedon. But the popes who succeeded him rejected talk of 'one will' in Christ, and instead adopted the language of 'two operations' and 'two wills', which they presented not as an innovation but as a simple corollary of the Chalcedonian teaching of two natures in Christ. Meanwhile, the emperors and patriarchs of Constantinople found the whole debate so divisive that in the *Ekthesis* of 638 (or rather 636) they forbade the assertion of either one or two operations in Christ, and in the *Typos* of 648 extended the ban to the discussion of will(s) in Christ. The papacy interpreted this as a rejection of the teaching of Chalcedon, and of the whole patristic tradition of which Chalcedon was the cornerstone. In 649 Pope Martin convened a synod of over a hundred bishops in Rome to define the doctrine of two wills and two operations, and to condemn as heretical the Byzantine position and the patriarchs who had upheld it. He even appointed a legate in Syria-Palestine with the task of replacing 'heretical' bishops with orthodox ones.

The theological issue was arcane, since it was not clear that the variations in Christological formulae expressed any real difference in Christian belief. But the political issue was clear: did the papacy have the right, and even (as it claimed) the duty, to declare in the strongest terms and in the most solemn canonical form its total opposition to the religious policy of the emperor its overlord and the eastern patriarchs? The synod





4 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

of 649 raised in a vividly dramatic way key questions about the relations between church and state, between east and west, in the Late Roman, Early Byzantine world.





GENERAL INTRODUCTION

I. EVENTS BEFORE THE SYNOD

The crisis from 610 to 638

According to the standard modern account of monoenergist and monothelete origins, interest in the Christological doctrines of the ‘one’ operation and will began in earnest during the 610s, a decade which had witnessed Heraclius’ dramatic usurpation and execution of the emperor Phocas (610), the Persian shah Khusrau II’s simultaneous invasion and occupation of the Roman Near East (including the capture of Jerusalem in 614) and eventual conquest of the prize province of Egypt (619).¹ Faced with these significant challenges to imperial power and in an attempt to shore up the suspect political allegiances of Christian schismatics in the east (so our account continues), the patriarch Sergius of Constantinople revived the political and spiritual ideal which had dogged Roman emperors since the divisive Council of Chalcedon (451): that is, the realisation of a Christological confession which would re-establish communion between Constantinople and the anti-Chalcedonian communities within its beleaguered eastern provinces. Thus Sergius entered into correspondence with numerous persons both Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian, enquiring into the ‘one operation’ as a possible means to assuage opponents’ suspicions that Chalcedonian doctrine in effect divided Christ;² while the emperor Heraclius himself, in Armenia during his daring counter-assault upon the Persians 622–28, engaged in successive Christological debates with high-profile, anti-Chalcedonian clerics in which a monoenergist formula was first aired with official sanction.³

1 For the narrative of Persian expansion in this decade see Stratos (1968–78) vol. 1 103–7; Flusin (1992) vol. 2 67–83; Kaegi (2002) 67–78.

2 For the report of these initial manoeuvrings, see the influential account given in the *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91. 332B–333A).

3 For events in Armenia see the documents in the so-called ‘monoenergist dossier’ from the Acts of Constantinople III, which report two meetings: one in which the emperor bettered the miaphysite Paul, and thereafter issued an ordinance against him disavowing ‘two





There is little reason to doubt that Constantinople was indeed engaged in such initiatives in this period. It is, however, crucial to note that our comprehension of such manoeuvres, at least in the period c.610–c.628, is dependent upon documents and narratives embedded in texts produced much later – the Acts of the Lateran Synod (649), the *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (c.655/6), and the Acts of Constantinople III (680/1) – and within the same anti-Constantinopolitan circles.⁴ Those same circles had much to gain in presenting the monoenergist initiative both as an innovation and as political machination, but, as we shall see in more detail in the subsequent section, it was neither. Dependence on these sources is inescapable, but to repeat the narrative contained within such texts without the slightest qualification is to risk recapitulating a later, partisan perspective which had much to gain from both obfuscating the actual intellectual origins of monoenergist doctrine (to be explored below) and in diluting the complexities of discussions in order to present Constantinople as the sole or principal agent.⁵

For independent attestation of Constantinopolitan manoeuvres we must therefore turn to the period of Heraclius' triumph over the Persians, and to a series of independent texts which record a remarkable and unprecedented period of diplomatic exchange between the various eastern churches. Since 622 Heraclius had launched from Constantinople intermittent invasions of Persian territories, and after the failure of a spectacular Avar siege of Constantinople in 626 (in which the Persians had been complicit, perhaps hoping to force the emperor to retreat from Persia to his capital) Heraclius in 627 confirmed a crucial alliance with the western Gök Turks, and together a Roman-Turkic force inflicted a significant defeat upon the Persians upon the plain of Nineveh, leaving an unobstructed path to the Persian capital at Ctesiphon. In 628, while Heraclius was wintering within Persia, he received news of a domestic coup against Khusrau, whose successor sued for peace. It had been a remarkable reversal of fortunes.⁶

operations'; and another in which Cyrus of Phasis (later patriarch of Alexandria) questioned the emperor about that doctrine. See Cyrus of Alexandria, *First Letter to Sergius* (ACO² II/2, 588–92); Sergius, *First Letter to Cyrus* (ibid. 528–30); and Sergius, *Letter to Honorius* (ibid. 534–6). Those meetings have been placed in 624 and 626; see Van Dieten (1972) 28–30; Winkelmann (2001) 54–5 no. 12 and 57 no. 18; and esp. Jankowiak (2009) 30–6.

4 For this date for the *Disputation with Pyrrhus*, placing it alongside the production of other texts within Maximus' trial literature, see Noret (1999).

5 For the pedigree of Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian discussion on the operations see 'The Constantinopolitan perspective' below.

6 For this stage of the war see esp. the collected articles of Howard-Johnston, (1994);





It is against this dramatic background that a range of sources, from numerous traditions, report various imperial attempts to achieve doctrinal union. The first of these meetings was nevertheless a failure. In 629 or 630, according to several sources, Heraclius met at Hierapolis the miaphysite patriarch of Antioch, Athanasius the Camel-Driver. The narrative and documentation embedded in a later Syriac chronicle report that the emperor – having earlier attempted, and failed, to enter into union with the miaphysite bishop of Edessa – demanded that Athanasius and twelve assembled bishops should accept a confession of faith recognising Chalcedon, and including a statement of the one operation in Christ. Upon their refusal, the same text continues, Heraclius launched a persecution through which several prominent monastic communities converted.⁷ From other sources we indeed ascertain that Athanasius now entered self-imposed exile.⁸ Although the initiative was therefore unsuccessful, precious echoes in sources of the period nevertheless give some impression of the distinct disquiet which Heraclius' actions at Hierapolis had caused amongst some adherents of Chalcedon.⁹

Elsewhere, indeed, the emperor's efforts were far more fruitful. In 630 (according to a range of sources from several traditions) the emperor had received a Sasanian diplomatic mission under the catholicus of the Nestorian Church in Persia, and after doctrinal discussions the emperor had accepted communion from the catholicus's hands.¹⁰ One source claims

(1995); (1999) 213–21; (2004); also Stratos (1968–78) vol. 1 135–236; Kaegi (2002) 100–91.

⁷ See Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* 11.1–4. Besides its narrative of events as described the same source contains a statement of faith from the emperor which includes a statement of the 'one operation' (but not the 'one will' [vol. 4, 403–4]), and a confession of Athanasius in which he denounces Chalcedon and the *Tome* of Leo. For the same account in less detail see *Anonymous Chronicle to 1234* 99–103; also Agapius, *Universal History* (467). For analysis of the meeting see Van Dieten (1972) 35–6, 219–32; Jankowiak (2009) 62–74.

⁸ See *Chronicle of Seert* 88, and the Armenian version of Michael the Syrian cited in Van Dieten (1972) 223–4. Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6121 – and Anastasius of Sinai, *Against the Monotheletes* 1 – suggest the realisation of the union after Athanasius' deception of the emperor.

⁹ See Eubulus of Lystra, *Against the libellus of Athanasius to the Emperor Heraclius* embedded in the *Doctrina Patrum* (Diekamp 141–8); Antiochus Monachus, *Pandects* 130 (PG 89. 1843 BC); Sophronius of Jerusalem, *Synodical Letter* 2.6.2, with Allen (2009) 145 nn. 173–6.

¹⁰ *Chronicle of Seert* 93; cp. the similar account in Mari, *History of the Nestorian Patriarchs* (Gismondi 61–2); and 'Amr b. Matta, *The Tower* (Gismondi 52–3). See also *Khuzistan Chronicle* (Guidi 30); Thomas of Marga, *Books of Governors* 2.4–6; *Translation*





that a monoenergist and even a monothelete formula was again included in their shared confession.¹¹ In 631 the imperial initiative expanded even further, for numerous independent sources describe a similar union with the catholicus of the miaphysite Armenian Church, which again culminated in the emperor's reception of communion.¹² It was, however, in the summer of 633 that the unionist efforts achieved their most spectacular success. In June Cyrus of Phasis (*locum tenens* of the Chalcedonian patriarchate of Alexandria and, it appears, a personal appointment of Heraclius) agreed a doctrinal accord with the 'Theodosians' – that is, those Egyptian miaphysites who adhered to the teachings of Severus of Antioch (d. 538). That accord was recognised in a document, the *Plerophoria* or *Pact of Union*, which is conspicuous for its inclusion (within a general neo-Chalcedonian Christological approach, including the simultaneous recognition of Christ both 'in' and 'from' two natures) of a monoenergist formula emphasising a single, 'theandric' (i.e. divine-human) operation.¹³ On the basis of that confession, it seems, miaphysite churches stretching from Alexandria to the central Egyptian city of Antioch entered into union with the Chalcedonians at Alexandria.¹⁴

In an explosion of unprecedented diplomatic negotiation, therefore, the emperor Heraclius had achieved what had so often eluded his predecessors:

of the Relics of Anastasius the Persian 2–3. Excluding the latter, these sources are usefully collated in Sako (1983) 29–58. For analysis of the meeting see *ibid.* 67–70; Flusin (1992) vol. 2 319–27; and Jankowiak (2009) 75–9.

11 *Chronicle of Seert* 93. Although Nestorius had spoken of a single, prosopic will – see Hovorun (2008) 9–15 – some doubt as to the inclusion of a monoenergist formula is raised in its absence from the catholicus Isho'yahb's Christological confessions as in 'Amr b. Matta's *The Tower* (Gismondi 53–4) and Isho'yahb II, *Christological Letter*, with the discussion of Sako (1983) 101–36.

12 See Ps.-Sebeos, *History* 41; *Narration on Armenian Affairs* 119–43; with the accounts of John Catholicos and Stephen Orbelian set out and translated in Garitte (1952) 288–98, with extensive citation from other Georgian and Armenian authors at *ibid.* 278–350. For the date see Howard-Johnston (1999) 228; and for a late seventh-century Armenian interest in monotheletism Greenwood (2008).

13 The *Pact of Union* is contained within the Acts of Constantinople III (ACO² II/2, 594–600). On the Alexandrian union within the same 'monoenergist dossier' cp. Cyrus, *Second Letter to Sergius* (*ibid.* 592). Cp. also the claim of Sergius, *Letter to Honorius* (*ibid.* 536–8).

14 See *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria* 'Benjamin' (Evetts 490–8). The same source refers to the prominent role of one Victor of Fayyūm in the union, on whom see also Benjamin, *Sermon on the Feast of Cana* (De Vis 64); and Isaac the Presbyter, *Life of Samuel of Kalamon* 8–9.





a union of several eastern churches, based at least in part on the monoenergist qualification to Chalcedon. Nevertheless, it is important that we not overemphasise the success of that initiative for, as at Hierapolis in 629/30, the sources which describe the unions in Persia, Armenia and Egypt are also unanimous in their description of simultaneous domestic resistance.¹⁵ In the end, however, the most serious opposition to the new Christological compromise came not from provincial, anti-Chalcedonian intransigents, as it had so often in the past. It came instead from a perhaps unexpected source. It came from a Chalcedonian.

Sophronius of Jerusalem – Damascene, Palestinian ascetic and quondam doctrinal advisor to the Chalcedonian patriarch of Alexandria, John the Almsgiver (610–20) – had spent much of the previous two decades as a refugee from the Persian occupation of the east, fleeing westward to North Africa.¹⁶ In June 633, however, he appears to have returned to Alexandria, and is said to have protested at the union, denouncing the ‘one operation’ formula and questioning the patristic citation (the sixth-century theologian Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite’s supposed ‘one theandric operation’) used to legitimise it.¹⁷ Failing to convince the Alexandrian patriarchal *locum tenens* Cyrus, however, Sophronius is then said to have travelled to Constantinople to protest before the patriarch Sergius, in fact a principal architect of the unionist initiative. In a letter to Rome now embedded in the later Acts of Constantinople III (680/1) – in which, late in 634 or 635, he explained to Pope Honorius the course of events thus far – Sergius reported his earlier despair at Sophronius’ protest, but also a remarkable retraction of his previous support for monoenergism, and the subsequent issuing of a decree or *Psēphos* which banned further discussion of the Christological operations.¹⁸

The publication of the *Psēphos* late in 633 or 634 occurred at the same

15 For this resistance, and for all the unions in more detail, see Jankowiak (2009) 49–96; Booth (2013a) 200–10.

16 For Sophronius’ staggered flight from the Persian invasion, see *Prologue to the Spiritual Meadow* (Usener 91–2); for his presence in North Africa, Maximus the Confessor, *Opusc.* 12 (PG 91. 142A).

17 See the accounts in Sergius, *Letter to Honorius* (ACO² II/2, 538); Maximus the Confessor, *Opusc.* 12 (PG 91. 143CD). For the citation of Pseudo-Dionysius see *Pact of Union* 7; for Sophronius’ protest, arguing (probably correctly) that the Areopagite’s original text read ‘new theandric operation’, see Sophronius, *Synodical Letter* 2.3.16; also Lateran Acts (p. 224 below). Cp. Maximus the Confessor, *Ambigua to Thomas* 5 on the same text.

18 See Sergius, *Letter to Honorius* (ACO² II/2, 540); for the same meeting *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91. 333AB). The text of the *Psēphos* is paraphrased in Sergius’ *Letter to*





moment as the Muslims had begun to encroach upon Roman territories. In February 634 the armies of the caliphate inflicted a defeat upon a Roman force at Gaza and thence began to overrun the Levant, culminating in successive victories in southern Syria in the summer of 636. Henceforth the Roman resistance collapsed. In 637 or 638 the Muslims captured Jerusalem and in 640 began the conquest of Egypt, culminating in the capitulation of Alexandria in September 642.¹⁹

It is within this context that Sophronius continued to oppose the earlier movement towards the official promotion of monoenergism. Late in 634 (and presumably with imperial approval) Sophronius was elected to the vacant patriarchal throne of Jerusalem and, with the armies of Islam expanding into Palestine, soon disregarded the principle of doctrinal silence enshrined within the *Psephos*.²⁰ In a bold affront to Constantinople he dispatched a synodical letter which contained an unambiguous statement of Christ's natural operations and an explicit denouncement of 'one' operation.²¹ At the same time he appended to that letter a huge heresiological catalogue notable for its denunciation of the miaphysite protagonists within Heraclius' attempted union at Hierapolis.²²

Sophronius' continued opposition to monoenergist doctrine, which included the dispatch of a diplomatic mission to Honorius at Rome, soon resulted in the organisation of a council on Cyprus which drew together, apparently in 636, representatives of all the Chalcedonian patriarchates (excepting the vacant see of Antioch).²³ That council – at which Sophronius and his disciple Maximus were marginalised – would have been excised

Honorius (ACO² II/2, 542–4); see also Maximus the Confessor, *Letter* 19 (PG 91. 592B–C), written in response to the publication of the document.

19 For this narrative see in general the reconstruction of Howard-Johnston (2010), with the discussion of the dating of Jerusalem's fall in Booth (2013a) 241–3.

20 For Sophronius' election see his own words in *Synodical Letter* 2.1.5; his appointment is also alluded to in *Letter to Honorius* (ACO² II/2, 538) and Honorius, *First Letter to Sergius* (ibid. 548). A date late in 634 for his election is demanded in the identification of Sophronius the patriarch with Sophronius, disciple of John Moschus, and in the placement of his master Moschus' burial in Palestine after September 634, both of which are almost certain; see Booth (2013a) 232–3 nn. 21, 26.

21 See esp. *Synodical Letter* 2.3.10. For the Christology of the *Letter* see Schönborn (1972) 209–24; Allen (2009) 44–6.

22 See Synodical Letter 2.6.2, Allen (2009), 144.

23 The diplomatic mission, under Stephen of Dora, is described in Lateran Acts (pp. 144–6 below). Stephen perhaps bore Sophronius' *Synodical Letter*, the reception of which is referred to in Honorius, *Second Letter to Sergius* (ACO² II/2, 624). On the version of Sophronius' *Letter* dispatched to Rome see Riedinger (1982b), (1984), (1994).





from the historical record, except for a precious single manuscript containing a hostile *Life* of the latter.²⁴ The result of that council, it appears, was the publication of the *Ekthesis*, an imperial document which once again banned discussion on the operations but which included a statement of Christ's single will (monotheletism).²⁵ It seems certain that the *Psēphos* had earlier included a statement to the effect that Christ could not have two opposed wills, but when in 635 Honorius (in a letter again preserved within the *Acts* of the Sixth Council) had responded to the aforementioned correspondence of Sergius detailing the course of the crisis thus far, he had affirmed 'one will', perhaps therefore precipitating its inclusion in the *Ekthesis* soon after.²⁶ Although, as we shall see in subsequent sections, this recognition of the 'one will' was incidental to that document's actual purpose, it was nevertheless to lead to a portentous shift of emphasis.²⁷

The crisis from 638 to 649

The publication of the imperial *Ekthesis* seems to have produced an abatement in public discussion. In 638 or soon after, moreover, the main protagonists – Sophronius, Sergius, and Honorius – all died.²⁸ Sophronius, with Jerusalem now under Muslim domination and the patriarchate racked with evident doctrinal discord, was not replaced;²⁹ Sergius' successor Pyrrhus reaffirmed the *Ekthesis*; and Heraclius no doubt hoped that the fragile consensus would hold.³⁰ But from around 640 two crucial

24 See *Life of Maximus the Confessor*, Syriac (by George of Resh'aina) 7–10, placing at the council representatives of the four active sees, including Sophronius and Cyrus of Alexandria. For the council and its background see Booth (2013a) 239–41.

25 On the identification of the 'Edict' described in George's *Life* and the *Ekthesis* – which later texts date to the twelfth indiction (638/9) – see Jankowiak (2009) 149–62.

26 The text of the *Psēphos* – which is summarised in Sergius, *Letter to Honorius* (ACO² II/2, 542), and which appears to have included the statement therein disavowing two opposed wills – is repeated *verbatim* within the text of the *Ekthesis* as contained within the Lateran Acts (pp. 227–9 below), which nevertheless adds an explicit statement of 'one will'. For a useful comparison of the two documents see Murphy and Sherwood (1973) 306–8. For Honorius' affirmation of 'one will' see *First Letter to Sergius* (ACO² II/2, 548–58).

27 See below, 'The Constantinopolitan perspective'.

28 For the date of Sophronius' death – in all likelihood in March 638 or March 639 – see Booth (2013a) 243–4, 250; for Sergius' death in December 638 *Book of Ceremonies* 2.30, Nicephorus, *Short History* 26; for Honorius' death in October, *Liber pontificalis* 72.

29 For 'irregular' bishops in Palestine before, during and after Sophronius' patriarchate see pp. 32 and 395 below.

30 For Pyrrhus' reported reaffirmation of the *Ekthesis* upon his election see Lateran Acts





developments shattered the brief doctrinal peace: first, Sophronius' formidable disciple Maximus the Confessor began a public agitation against the assertion of 'one will' in the *Ekthesis*; and, second, the Roman popes performed a dramatic doctrinal volte face. The Roman *Liber pontificalis* (or *Book of Pontiffs*) points to a significant delay between the death of Honorius and the election of his successor suggestive of tensions with the capital.³¹ Indeed, the short pontificate of his eventual successor, Severinus, in the middle months of 640, is remembered as orthodox in later, anti-monothelete literature, and, although Severinus' precise position must remain unclear,³² that of his own successor, John IV, is not in doubt, for there survives in several forms a letter of John to Heraclius' sons and successors, Heraclius Constantine and Heraclonas, in which he launched upon an extended apologia of Honorius' 'orthodox' credentials, arguing that the latter's affirmation of 'one will' applied to Christ's human will alone, and did not therefore preclude 'two wills'.³³

It is in this same period that we can first perceive Maximus' emergence as a public opponent of monothelete doctrine.³⁴ Maximus was a Palestinian ascetic and the foremost disciple of Sophronius.³⁵ During the Persian occupation of Rome's eastern provinces (610–29) he had retreated, with his master, to North Africa, and although he appears to have returned to

(pp. 223–4 below). See also the citation of a letter of Pyrrhus to Pope John IV; see Lateran Acts (pp. 358–9 below), Acts of Constantinople III (ACO² II/2, 626); also *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91. 328B).

31 *Liber pontificalis* 72–3. Cp. also Maximus the Confessor, *Letter to Thalassius*, which describes the attempts of the Constantinopolitans to enforce a doctrinal *charta* (sc. the *Ekthesis*) upon the Roman *apocrisarii*, who were able to avoid the issue. Severinus is not mentioned but for the date see Sherwood (1952) 43.

32 For the treatment of Severinus as orthodox see Maximus the Confessor, *Opusc.* 12 (PG 91. 143B), *Liber diurnus* (PL 105. 66B).

33 For the three versions of John's *Letter* see CPG 9383. In the Arabic versions, John also makes an explicit statement of 'two operations' and 'two wills'; see Schacht (1936) 236. See also the reports of John's convocation of a council to condemn the *Ekthesis* upon his election, at Pope Theodore, *Letter to Paul* (PL 87. 78A, 79A); *Synodikon Vetus* 137; Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6121.

34 Maximus' first text on the specific question of the Christological wills appears to be *Opusc.* 4, from c.640; see Larchet (1998a) 27; and for the formation of opposition to monotheletism Jankowiak (2013).

35 For Maximus' Palestinian (rather than Constantinopolitan) origins see George of Resh'aina, *Life of Maximus* with Brock (1973); Boudignon (2004); Booth (2013a) 143–51, correcting the later Greek hagiographical tradition which transforms him into a Constantinopolitan.





the east during the period of Sophronius' patriarchate, after the Muslim conquest of the Levant he once again sought refuge in North Africa.³⁶ Several sources suggest that in the period after Honorius' death Maximus and his disciples continued Sophronius' earlier diplomatic effort to secure Roman cooperation,³⁷ and, from around 640, he produced a series of texts which denounced monothelitism and developed a doctrine of the 'two wills' in Christ.³⁸ At the same time he composed his own doctrinal defence of Pope Honorius.³⁹

In later sources Maximus and his disciples would claim that in this period, shortly before his death, the emperor Heraclius had written to John IV and abrogated monothelitism, blaming it on the influence of malevolent advisors.⁴⁰ Although that claim was a piece of disingenuous propaganda,⁴¹ after the rapid turnover of emperors following Heraclius' death at the beginning of 641 and the eventual succession of his grandson Constans II in November, the stance of Constantinople appears to have softened.⁴² A text now extant in later Arabic versions – and purporting to be a letter from Constans to John IV – suggests that the emperor had written to Rome with a statement of intent to withdraw the *Ekthesis*,⁴³ although this might be dismissed as a further piece of anti-monothelite propaganda, from the correspondence of John IV's successor it does indeed appear that the new Constantinopolitan patriarch Paul (elected in October 641, following the

36 We know that Maximus was in Carthage after Pentecost 632, for he there witnessed the forced baptism of Jews referred to in the conclusion to *Letter* 8; see Devreesse (1937). Later *Letter* 12 places him in the provinces in November 641 (PG 91. 464C). Between these points George of Resh'aina, *Life of Maximus* 17–18, however, places him in Syria on the eve of the Muslim conquest (c.636) before a retreat to North Africa.

37 See the account of the visit of Maximus' disciple, Anastasius, to Rome to enquire about Honorius' *First Letter to Sergius*, given in Maximus the Confessor, *Opusc.* 20 (PG 91. 244C–D). See also the *libellus* of the aforementioned Stephen of Dora, whose mission to Rome on behalf of Sophronius was the first of three visits, the second, it seems, occurring as part of an effort to convince Honorius' successors to change doctrinal direction; see Lateran Acts (pp. 145–6 below).

38 See the useful list in Hovorun (2008) 77–8.

39 Maximus the Confessor, *Opusc.* 20, with the analysis of Larchet (1998b) 128–33. Cp. *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91. 328B–329C).

40 See *Relatio motionis* 9; Maximus the Confessor, *Opusc.* 12 (PG 91. 142D–143A).

41 See Alexakis (1995–96), demonstrating that Heraclius' letter to John in fact asserted monothelitism. Cp. Rizou-Couroupos (1987).

42 For the chronology of this year see Treadgold (1990).

43 Constans, *Letter to Pope John IV* (German trans. in Schacht [1936] 246–9).





fall from grace and subsequent resignation of Pyrrhus)⁴⁴ had not referred to the *Ekthesis* within his synodical letter.⁴⁵

The election of the new pope Theodore points to the ever-increasing implication of papal politics with the Palestinian circle of Maximus, for his father (according to the *Liber pontificalis*) was ‘a bishop from Jerusalem’.⁴⁶ His accession appears to have occurred without imperial approval, and in a series of extant letters the pope adopted an aggressive stance towards the capital, demanding that the *Ekthesis* be rescinded and that Paul’s predecessor Pyrrhus be deposed and deprived of his honorifics, in accordance with proper canonical procedure.⁴⁷ For some time Paul appears to have held his silence, but contained within the Acts of the Lateran Synod we find a letter dated to May 645, and addressed to Theodore, in which the patriarch refers to the calumnies which he has endured at the hands of the pope and his *apocrisarii* (i.e. ambassadors), and ignored for the sake of peace. Paul, however, declares the time for silence to have passed, and proceeds to defend an explicit declaration of ‘one will’.⁴⁸

We cannot ascertain the precise reason for Paul’s more forthright defence of an explicit monothelete formula, but it nevertheless appears to have had an unintended consequence, for a mere two months later there occurred in North Africa a dramatic confrontation between Maximus and the former Constantinopolitan patriarch Pyrrhus in a doctrinal debate in Carthage. The context in which the ex-patriarch had arrived in Africa, the circumstances in which he agreed to the confrontation and even the content of his doctrinal discussion with Maximus must all remain obscure,⁴⁹ but the result was his full capitulation and a subsequent retreat to Rome to submit

44 See Nicephorus, *Short History* 32.

45 Paul’s synodical is not extant but see Pope Theodore, *Letter to Constans* (German trans. in Schacht [1936] 249–52); *Letter to Paul* (PL 87. 75C–80B); *Letter to the Bishops Who Consecrated Paul* (PL 87. 81B–82D). For the first of these cp. Eutychius, *Annals* (*Antiochene Recension*) [Cheiko 325–32].

46 See *Liber pontificalis* 75.

47 For this correspondence see pp. 52–3. For Theodore’s apparent election without imperial approval – due to its speed – see Jankowiak (2009) 204.

48 See Lateran Acts (pp. 256–8 below, with the date preserved in the Latin at 260). See also p. 358 and Acts of Constantinople III (ACO² II/2, 608).

49 The debate is supposedly recorded in the *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91. 288–353), although the text is a clear piece of propaganda and perhaps dates to the same period of other pro-Maximian dialogues (c.655–6); see Noret (1999). It has been speculated that Pyrrhus participated in the hope of regaining the patriarchate of Constantinople on the back of the exarch Gregory’s rebellion (below); see e.g. Van Dieten (1972) 88, Boudignon (2007) 260–1. For the context of his arrival see Booth (2013a) 284–7.





a doctrinal *libellus* before the pope.⁵⁰ Theodore then took the remarkable step of recognising Pyrrhus as patriarch proper of Constantinople, a gross usurpation of imperial prerogative.

Maximus appears also to have withdrawn from North Africa to Rome in order to witness the official recantation of his defeated opponent, but in North Africa the anti-monothelite resistance now gained momentum.⁵¹ According to the correspondence contained within the later Acts of the Lateran Synod, between September 645 and August 646 the bishops of Byzacena and Africa Proconsularis met in separate councils to condemn monothelitism (those of Numidia, Byzacium and Mauretania also attempted to convene, but were prevented through an enigmatic domestic disturbance).⁵² But soon after this the highest ranking Roman official in North Africa, the exarch Gregory (who may have been a relative of Constans, and who is also said to have presided over Maximus' disputation with Pyrrhus⁵³), entered into open rebellion against Constantinople. Again the immediate reasons for, and purposes of, that rebellion are unknown, but its coincidence with the anti-monothelite disputations and councils, as well as later claims that both Theodore and Maximus had offered their support to the usurper, suggest something far more significant than an assertion of, for example, 'regional self-help', and instead point to a full-scale secession from Constantinopolitan rule.⁵⁴ The exarch's ambitions were, however,

50 So *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91. 353A–B); confirmed in *Liber pontificalis* 75; also Lateran Acts (pp. 162, 165 below), Theodore Spudaeus, *Narrations* 24. See also in this context the discussion of the appropriate honorifics to apply to Pyrrhus in Maximus the Confessor, *Opusc.* 12 (PG 91. 144B–C), which Boudignon (2007) 256 n. 22 places in the immediate aftermath of the disputation.

51 For Maximus' retreat to Rome see George of Resh'aina, *Life of Maximus* 19. That he went with Pyrrhus is implied in *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91. 353A); *Record of the Trial* 6. It seems that while in Sicily, en route to Rome, Maximus was questioned about his earlier correspondence with Pyrrhus on the *Psēphos*; see Maximus, *Opusc.* 9 (PG 91. 132A–B).

52 For the correspondence see Lateran Acts (pp. 161–86 below). For discussion of their authorship and authenticity see Riedinger (1980) 37–50; Conte (1989) 54–9. On the nature of the domestic disturbance see Jankowiak (2009) 230–1; Booth (2013a) 287–8.

53 That Gregory was a member of the Heraclian family was first suggested (on the basis of his name) in Diehl (1896) 525 n. 7. For his presidency of the Carthaginian debate see *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91. 288A).

54 For those later claims see Maximus' reported dream predicting Gregory's imminent victory – and related to the usurper through Theodore – in *Record of the Trial* 2, with the brilliant analysis of Brandes (1998) 185–92. For Gregory's rebellion as an attempt to create a separatist, 'orthodox' state see Van Dieten (1972) 84 with n. 32; Jankowiak (2009) 220–1.





to prove premature. Soon afterwards he confronted a Muslim attempt to expand westward from the Pentapolis and, it appears, fell in battle.⁵⁵

The defeat of Gregory – which appears also to have prompted Pyrrhus to travel to Ravenna and return to the monothelete fold – was no doubt a significant relief for Constans' still fledgling regime.⁵⁶ Nevertheless, the menacing transition from religious to political dissent evident in North Africa, realised within a wider context of continued Muslim raiding into Anatolia and Transcaucasia, appears to have prompted the authorities at Constantinople to resume a more irenic approach.⁵⁷ In 647/8 the emperor published the *Typos*, a document which extended the earlier prescriptions of the *Psēphos* and the *Ekthesis* into a ban on discussion of both operations and wills, and threatened the standard (and severe) canonical penalties against dissenters.⁵⁸ Indeed, a confluence of sources suggests that when the principal Roman *apocrisiarius* Anastasius (said in later sources to be a disciple of Maximus) and two eminent devotees in the capital refused to accept the new initiative the emperor and patriarch applied the due punishment, stripping them of their offices and sending them into exile in the Crimea.⁵⁹

In an attempt to gain acceptance for the *Typos* Constans had dispatched emissaries to Rome to announce the new initiative, but the official retreat from monotheletism seems but to have intensified the determination of the capital's western critics, and the new document was rejected.⁶⁰ Even before the publication of the *Typos* Theodore had intensified the papal dissent: first, he had convened a council once again to condemn Pyrrhus, and is

55 See the group of sources dependent on the *Chronicle* of Theophilus of Edessa: Theophanes, *Chronicle* A.M. 6138; Agapius, *Universal History* (Vasiliev 479); Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* 11.10; *Anonymous Chronicle to 1234*, 126. The final three sources report Gregory's subsequent submission to Constans in the capital, but from Islamic and Latin sources it in fact appears that he was killed in battle; see e.g. Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ Miṣr* (trans. Torrey 301–2), with Fredegar, *Chronicle* 4.81; also *Anonymous Chronicle to 741*, 24; *Anonymous Chronicle to 754*, 38.

56 For Pyrrhus' return see *Liber pontificalis* 75; also *Synodikon Vetus* 138; Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6121.

57 For this context of further Muslim expansion see Howard-Johnston (2010).

58 For the text see Lateran Acts (pp. 262–3 below). For the date see *Record of the Trial* 6; Theodore Spudaeus, *Hypomnesticum* (Greek) 6.

59 See *Liber pontificalis* 76; Lateran Acts (p. 124 below); Theodore Spudaeus, *Hypomnesticum* (Greek) 6; also *Hypomnesticum* (Latin) 4.

60 Such embassies are suggested at *Record of the Trial* 4; also Martin, *Letter to Constans* (PL 87. 144B).





said to have signed the deposition in the eucharistic blood;⁶¹ second, he had issued against Paul a provocative deposition;⁶² and third, he had taken the remarkable step of investing a prominent Palestinian disciple of Sophronius – Stephen, bishop of Dora – as papal representative in the east, charged with the examination and deposition of ‘irregular’ (i.e. monothelete) bishops within the patriarchate of Jerusalem.⁶³ Although that mission met (it seems) with near-universal resistance, it nevertheless provides ample measure of the striking papal posturing which marked Theodore’s pontificate.⁶⁴ It is, then, within this dual context of papal ecclesiological assertiveness and provocation on the one hand and the Constantinopolitan retreat from the ‘one will’ formula on the other that Theodore committed himself to a further, even more remarkable act: the convocation of a pan-Italian council to debate monothelete doctrine.⁶⁵

61 See *Synodikon Vetus* 138; Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6121.

62 See *Liber pontificalis* 75, which suggests that the deposition occurred after the re-recantation of Pyrrhus but before the reception in Rome of the *Typos*.

63 See Lateran Acts (p. 148 below). It is in the context of this mission that we should place Maximus the Confessor, *Opusc.* 15, a florilegium dispatched to Stephen. From the title of the latter we know that Maximus was in Rome, and as the same florilegium was later used within the Lateran Acts, this would place Stephen’s mission c.646–c.648. The existence of monoenergist and monothelete bishops in Palestine is evidenced before, during and after the pontificate of Sophronius (634–c.638/9); see Pope Martin, *Letter to John of Philadelphia* (PL 87. 159A–B), also id., *Letter to Pantaleon* (PL 87. 172B–D), and in George of Resh’aina’s *Life of Maximus*, the author of which is a bishop subordinate to Sophronius as patriarch of Jerusalem but nevertheless an opponent of his doctrine. For these groups see esp. Schönborn (1972) 85–9; Flusin (1992) vol. 2 359–62; Levy-Rubin (2001) 291–8.

64 For the failure of Stephen’s mission see Pope Martin, *Letter to Pantaleon* (PL 87. 169A–C); also id., *Letter to John of Philadelphia* (PL 87. 155A–159B).

65 Though meeting in October under Pope Martin (elected July 649), Theodore must have planned the synod, since three months was too short a time to organise a major council.





II. UNDERSTANDING THE CRISIS

1. THE CONSTANTINOPOLITAN PERSPECTIVE

Traditional interpretations of the narrative described thus far may be summarised as follows: Heraclius and Sergius, searching for a means to unite the eastern churches in a period of crisis, imposed Chalcedonian monoenergism and monotheletism as a point of compromise with anti-Chalcedonian communities, either inventing the doctrines themselves or, at best, borrowing them from anti-Chalcedonian thought; those doctrines, nevertheless, were alien to the teaching of Chalcedon and of Leo's Tome, of which Sophronius, Maximus and the post-Honorian popes mounted a principled defence, rescuing the Orthodox faith from artificial doctrines which in effect amounted to the return of Apollinarianism (that is, the denial of Christ's full humanity).

Although that narrative still has its adherents, much recent scholarship has nevertheless mounted a fundamental challenge to its basic assumptions.¹ Before moving to that scholarship, however, we must first make a crucial distinction between monoenergism (the doctrine of one Christological 'operation') and monotheletism (the doctrine of one Christological 'will'). Reflecting the polemic of the period after c.640 – when the doctrines of the operation(s) and will(s) became intertwined – it can be tempting to conflate the two terms, and to assume that the later assertion of 'one will' was a simple extension of the earlier 'one operation'. As we shall see, however, the circumstances in which each doctrine was promoted, and the audiences amongst which each were discussed, were quite distinct. In order to comprehend the imperial perspective on them, therefore, we must be careful to differentiate the contexts.²

It cannot be a coincidence that the unionist movement made its most

1 For those adherents see e.g. (from the historical perspective) Sánchez Valencia (2003), Ekonomou (2007) 81–5; (from the theological) Bathrellos (2004), Hovorun (2008).

2 See Jankowiak (2013).





significant advances in the immediate aftermath of Heraclius' triumph over the Persians and the subsequent reestablishment of a state which once again embraced the five Christian patriarchates. For some, perhaps, liberation from Persian occupation had served to elevate the importance of Christian communion above continued disagreements over doctrine; for others, no doubt, God had demonstrated his support for the emperor in unambiguous terms. Indeed, the various unionist attempts set out above were punctuated with an event which reveals much about the mood in Constantinople: the restoration of the True Cross to Jerusalem. The Cross had been removed to Ctesiphon after the Persian capture of Jerusalem in 614,³ but in the aftermath of Khusrau's fall the Persians had returned it to Roman hands.⁴ In March 630 it was restored to Golgotha in an elaborate ritual in which the emperor himself participated⁵ – the first time that a Christian emperor had visited Jerusalem.⁶ The rhetoric of the Constantinopolitan court proclaimed Heraclius a new David, a new Constantine.⁷ The event itself reasserted the place of the Roman empire within the providential scheme of God, and proclaimed an era of both cosmological renewal and, perhaps, eschatological expectation.⁸ Such descriptions, then, seem to capture something of the context of triumphalism, fellowship and expectation in which Heraclius conducted his programme of ecclesial reunification.

It has long been recognised that the doctrine of 'one operation' – included within at least some of the subsequent shared confessions – had a significant pedigree within miaphysite circles. It is in particular a feature of the Christological doctrine of Severus of Antioch, for whom the famous formula from the Tome of Leo ('Each form in communion with the other operates what is proper to it, the Word performing what is the Word's, and the body accomplishing what is the body's')⁹ risked, in its latter part at least,

3 See Booth (2013a) 94–100 for details and context.

4 For the various traditions of the Cross' return to Roman hands, *ibid.* 155–7.

5 See Strategius, *On the Fall of Jerusalem* 24; Nicephorus, *Short History* 18; Ps.-Sebeios, *History* 41. For analysis see esp. Mango (1985) 105–17.

6 Contemporaries recognised this fact: see *Return of the Relics of Anastasius the Persian* 1.

7 See George of Pisidia, *On the Restoration of the Cross*, with Flusin (1992) vol. 2, 312–19; Drijvers (2002).

8 For these levels of symbolism, and the general context of eschatological expectation, see esp. Stoyanov (2011) 45–75.

9 This translates the Greek version used in the east (ACO II. 1, p. 28, 12–13). The original Latin version uses a slightly different vocabulary.





dividing Christ into agents, one divine and one human.¹⁰ In 1997, however, – arguing against the view that monoenergist doctrine was a Heraclian importation to, or imposition upon, ‘orthodox’ Chalcedonian doctrine – Karl-Heinz Uthemann published a seminal article in which he demonstrated the organic development of discussion on the operations within various *Chalcedonian* circles, in effect establishing that Heraclius and Sergius, far from ‘inventing’ monoenergism within Chalcedonian discussion, instead supported one side of a conspicuous issue which had simmered beneath the surface of Christological argument, both Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian, since the Tome of Leo.¹¹ Official support for monoenergism, therefore, cannot be considered a ‘heretical’ departure from the teaching of Chalcedon. There was no ‘orthodox’ consensus on the Christological operations from which to depart.

At the same time, to regard the Constantinopolitan promotion of monoenergism as the manipulation of religion for political purposes is to misunderstand the ideological impulses which informed it. There can be little doubt that Heraclius – in his aspiration to mirror on the ecclesial plane the reunification which he had achieved of Rome’s eastern provinces – would have perceived the political advantage to be derived from a doctrine which seemed to assuage miaphysite suspicions of their opponents’ veiled Nestorianism. But the evidence suggests that the promotion of the doctrine, and indeed the wider unionist initiative of which it was part, was also underpinned in a broader theological principle according to which the universal communion of believers was elevated above continued disagreements over doctrinal minutiae. As Heinz Ohme has pointed out in an important piece, when confronted with dissent the leading monoenergists are said in several places to have advocated an explicit principle of doctrinal *oikonomia*, or ‘accommodation’.¹² According to that same principle (which had a significant patristic pedigree) differences of expression could be tolerated so long as the faith itself remained inviolate.¹³

10 On Severan and miaphysite monoenergism see esp. Hovorun (2008) 15–41. For the problematic status of Leo’s formula during the monoenergist/monothelite controversy – and the attempts of theologians to alter it in accordance with their beliefs – see Bathrellos (2004) 176–87.

11 Uthemann (1997), whose basic argument is now expanded in Lange (2012).

12 Ohme (2008a).

13 See Dagron (1990). For a contemporary discussion of the circumstances in which *oikonomia* might be applied – including, we should note, when the faith was not harmed, when the faith was under attack and when the same faith was expressed but in different





In appealing to this principle, therefore, the monoenergists revealed the wider religious imperative that informed the unionist movement: that is, the shared communion of the Christian *oikoumenē*.

Thus, for example, in Sergius' aforementioned Letter to Honorius – in which, late in 634 or 635, he described his previous encounter with Sophronius in Constantinople – he recalled his desperate pleas to the aged ascetic, during which he had pointed out that the Fathers 'can be seen to have employed economy and compromises pleasing to God for the sake of gaining the salvation of more souls, without undermining any of the precision of the orthodox doctrines of the church'. 'We thought this harsh (for how could it not be harsh and extremely harmful?)', he commented to Honorius with reference to Sophronius' dissent, 'since it was going to destroy and overturn the whole of that accord and unity so happily achieved in the city of Alexandria and all its provinces; at no time until now had they agreed to commemorate the mere name of our inspired and celebrated father Leo or of the holy, great and ecumenical council at Chalcedon, but now in a clear and loud voice they were acclaiming the council in their divine rites.'¹⁴ Here, then, we seem far removed from the conception of the monoenergists as manipulative politicians, pursuing an imperial agenda while demonstrating a total disregard for religious principle.

Given the spectacular success of the unionist movement in the period c.629–33 – based at least in part upon the confession of 'one operation' – Sergius' concession to Sophronius after the confrontation in 633, and the subsequent publication of the *Psēphos*, might seem quite remarkable.¹⁵ In part that concession must reflect the considerable reputation of Sophronius; but it nevertheless appears consistent with an ideological programme in which *oikonomia* and consensus were the guiding imperatives. In abrogating monoenergism and banning discussion on the Christological operations, therefore, Sergius and Heraclius might have hoped to curtail Sophronius' dissent while also maintaining the recent unions – in particular, we should note, if the monoenergist formula was not so much the crux of the unions (as subsequent polemic might lead us to suppose)

words – see the description of the Chalcedonian patriarch Eulogius of Alexandria's thought in Photius, *Bibliotheca* (ed. Henry, vol. 4, 111–13), with Ohme (2008) 325–32.

¹⁴ Sergius, *Letter to Honorius* (ACO² II/2, 538–40), with Ohme (2008) 310–13. For further statements of monoenergism or monotheletism as *oikonomia* see e.g. Lateran Acts (p. 159 below); *Record of the Trial 4*; *Disputation at Bizye 3*, 12.

¹⁵ For the narrative of these events see above pp. 7–9.





but rather an important but not indispensable element within a wider neo-Chalcedonian approach which emphasised the unity of Christ.¹⁶ It seems probable, moreover, that the desire for consensus had in this period assumed a heightened importance, for the publication of the *Psephos* occurred at the same moment at which the Muslims had launched their first serious encroachments into Roman Palestine, unravelling the rhetoric of imperial renewal and once again casting over the empire the shadow of divine disfavour. Little wonder, then, that Constantinople, confronted with the threat of an ascendant Arabian power, might prove unwilling to spoil for a theological spat with an eminent ascetic.

After the theological retreat from monoenergism evident in the *Psephos*, the subsequent imperial *Ekthesis* might appear paradoxical, for the emperor here reiterated the prohibition against discussion on the operations, but nevertheless included a statement of the 'one will'. What was the purpose? Most scholars have presumed that the monothelete initiative was the intellectual heir of monoenergism, and that its purpose was identical – that is, the reconciliation of anti-Chalcedonian communities in the eastern provinces.¹⁷ But if this was indeed the *Ekthesis*' prevailing purpose, we must then wonder at the simultaneous decision still to suppress the 'one operation' formula, which should have been the natural companion of the 'one will'. Was this, perhaps, a desperate attempt to appease all parties, to acknowledge Sophronius' critique while reviving a monadic expression in respect of Christ?

Such a reading is made problematic in the circumstances in which monotheletism was both raised and recognised. As we have seen, it is possible to outline the genesis of official support for monoenergism in Constantinopolitan and Alexandrian discussions with anti-Chalcedonian communities, when the reintegration of the Roman east made possible a potential reunion of its churches. In contrast, there is little indication that discussion on the Christological will had formed a significant component of those same discussions, and at the moment of the publication of the *Ekthesis* the anti-Chalcedonian communities of the Roman east were once again receding from Roman control.¹⁸ In contrast to monoenergism, the

16 For the presence or absence of the monoenergist formula within the unions see the discussion above at p. 8.

17 So e.g. Hovorun (2008) 162; Greenwood (2008) 252–3.

18 See e.g. the general absence of the question of the will from the so-called 'monoenergist dossier' cited at the Sixth Ecumenical Council. An exception is Sergius, *Letter to Honorius* (ACO² II/2, 546), referring to Heraclius' request, while at Edessa for copy





context in which monotheletism had been raised, and then recognised, was one of *intra*-Chalcedonian discussion driven through Sophronius' dissent: the letter of Sergius to Honorius disavowing two opposed wills (634); Honorius' subsequent affirmation of 'one will' in response (635); and the publication of the *Ekthesis* (636).¹⁹

Our perspective can be refined even further if we consider the intellectual pedigree of the 'one will' formula. As we have seen, debates on the Christological operation(s) were a conspicuous if somewhat marginal feature of both Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian discussion in the period after the council itself (451). Discussion on the Christological will(s), in contrast, was far more limited, for the most part confined to exegeses of Christ's words at Gethsemane, and conducted in contexts where the principal goal of polemicists was to equate the will(s) of Father and Son rather than treat the divine and human natures in Christ; after Chalcedon, the evidence for more advanced speculation is meagre.²⁰ We can indeed measure this post-Chalcedonian neglect further, for when participants in the debate later turned to the production of patristic florilegia to legitimise their positions both sides discovered ample materials from which to construct a supposed, post-Chalcedonian support for 'one' or 'two' operation(s). But contemporaneous authorities on the will or wills amounted to almost nothing.²¹

of the patristic passages relating to one will and operation in the *libellus* of Menas (see n. 20 below). Cp. also Sergius, *First Letter to Cyrus* (ACO² II/2, 528). The evident interest in Menas' text, however, arose from its support for the 'one operation' rather than the 'one will'.

19 For the narrative and the documents see above pp. 9–11.

20 The most important document is the *libellus* of Menas to Pope Vigilius, which included a statement of the 'one operation' and 'one will'; see Winkelmann (2001) 45–6, no. 1 (dating it to 552). It was an important text for the monoenergists and monotheletes – see its citation in the monothelete florilegium in Brock (1985) 37–8 – but was condemned as a fake in the Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council (ACO² II/2, 532). Nevertheless, there is little reason to doubt its authenticity. Not least, it is clear that earlier opponents of monoenergism and monotheletism thought it genuine; see e.g. *Disputation at Bizye* 4 and *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91. 328AB).

21 See the florilegia in Session V of the Lateran Acts; cp. Brock (1985), with the previous note. Within this context see also the dyotheletes' falsification of earlier definitions of will discussed in e.g. Richard (1966); Madden (1982). For the psychology of forgery in the crisis see Wessel (2001), esp. 215–19. Given the general absence of discussion on the will(s) in the period after Chalcedon, we should be suspicious of those modern perspectives which attempt to establish one or other doctrine as the more popular or natural; see e.g. Hovorun (2008) 164; Levy-Rubin (2001) 286–9.





There is therefore little to suggest that the ‘one will’ formula contained within the *Ekthesis* was considered problematic.²² As is described in more detail below, ‘one will’ was not intended as the central statement of the document, but was rather a reaffirmation of the accepted principle (expressed within the *Psēphos*) that Christ could not possess two opposed wills; the actual purpose of the document was to repeat the ban on discussing operations. The monotheletism of the *Ekthesis* was not, therefore, a Constantinopolitan attempt to revive the unionist initiative of c.629–33, to secure the allegiance of anti-Chalcedonians under threat of Muslim dominion. It was rather an attempt to restore the *Chalcedonian* status quo, to return to the agreement expressed within the *Psēphos*. Nor should we assume, moreover, an immediate association of ‘will’ and ‘operation’ in the minds of contemporaries. Thus the leading opponent of ‘one operation’, Sophronius, demonstrates an almost total disinterest in the issue of the Christological will(s).²³ Indeed, it appears that as patriarch of Jerusalem he consented to the publication of the *Ekthesis*.²⁴

It was Maximus the Confessor who problematised the monotheletism of the *Ekthesis*, and therein precipitated a period of Christological innovation on both sides of the discussion.²⁵ But for a formal Constantinopolitan defence of the ‘one will’ formula we must wait until the middle 640s. In the meantime, as we have seen, Patriarch Pyrrhus had ratified the *Ekthesis*. But it is notable that in the excerpts from his letters contained in the Acts of the Lateran Synod we do not find the ‘one will’ formula, but rather a restatement of the principle that two opposed wills cannot coexist in Christ;²⁶ and, even in the first months of 640, it is the *Ekthesis*’ ban on

22 See pp. 197–8 below for an argument that ‘one will’ was asserted in the *Ekthesis* only incidentally and without any awareness that it would prove controversial.

23 See e.g. the somewhat unguarded statements at Sophronius, *Letter to Arcadius* 44; *Synodical Letter* 2.3.13; *On the Nativity* 3.

24 See George of Resh’aina, *Life of Maximus the Confessor* 15–16, with the claim that the ‘four’ patriarchs recognised the imperial edict (perhaps excluding Antioch, the Chalcedonian throne of which still was vacant). That reading is supported in the title to the *Ekthesis* as preserved in the Latin Acts of the Lateran Synod (p. 226 below), stating that *cum multa satisfactione et gratia exciperunt patriarchi[cis] cum sedibus praesules* (‘The leading bishops, along with the patriarchal sees, received it with great satisfaction and favour’).

25 Maximus’ departure from previous patristic discussions of the will is demonstrated in Bathrellos (2004) 129–47; for the monothelete contribution to the same debate, see below.

26 See Lateran Acts (pp. 358–9 below). For the same letter to John cp. the passage in Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council (ACO² II/2, 626); also *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91. 328B). Cp. Lateran Acts (p. 233 below), citing a (separate) conciliar letter of Pyrrhus but omitting its doctrinal content.





debating operations which appears most to exercise Maximus (before, we may suppose, the *volte face* of Severinus provided him with a more secure basis from which to pursue the refutation of the ‘one will’).²⁷ The focus on the question of the Christological wills, therefore, was a gradual development conducted against Constantinopolitan attempts to restore the *status quo* within Chalcedonian circles, and in almost total isolation from the anti-Chalcedonian circles engaged in previous decades.²⁸

As Wolfram Brandes has insisted, moreover, it is crucial that we place those same attempts within the context of continued Muslim expansion, which no doubt reinforced the desire for domestic consensus.²⁹ At time of the *Ekthesis*, as we have seen, the Romans had suffered a series of serious defeats within the Near East, and the Levant had in effect been abandoned. After a desperate period in which the conquest of Egypt was postponed through the provision of tribute, from 640 to 642 it too was overrun.³⁰ With the core of the Roman east now in the control of the nascent caliphate, the remainder of the decade witnessed more or less continuous encroachments upon remaining Roman territories in North Africa, Anatolia and the Transcaucasus.³¹

The significant upheavals which characterised the aftermath of Heraclius’ death in January 641 – which witnessed three separate senior emperors in a period of less than twelve months – left the regime of the emperor Constans, still a child upon his accession, in a precarious position.³² Almost at once the new emperor’s supporters were forced to fend off an attempt of the general Valentine first to elevate himself to the

27 See Maximus the Confessor, *Letter to Thalassius*, a Latin fragment in which Maximus reports the Constantinopolitan reception of a new pope’s *apocrisarii* – the circumstances demand that the pope is Severinus, elected some eighteen months after Honorius’ death in October 638 (*Liber pontificalis* 74) – at the attempts to secure their approval of a doctrinal *charta*, which must be the *Ekthesis*. It is notable, therefore, that Maximus refers to it as banning discussion on the operations rather than affirming one will, although it is possible that the fragment ends before a refutation of monotheletism. For the date see Sherwood (1952) 43.

28 Notwithstanding, of course, a subsequent consolidation of miaphysite monotheletism in response to the Chalcedonian debate; see e.g. MacCoull (1990) and Hagedorn and Hagedorn (2011) (Egypt); Levy-Rubin (2001) (Palestine and Syria); Greenwood (2008) (Armenia).

29 Brandes (1998) 146–51.

30 See Hoyland (1997) 574–90; Booth (2013b).

31 Howard-Johnston (2010).

32 See Treadgold (1990).





purple as co-emperor and then to oust Constans from the throne.³³ It is in this charged political context that we must situate the aforementioned reports that, in communication with John IV, the emperor and his patriarch Paul had offered significant conciliation to Rome, whose popes were now refocused on resistance to the 'one will' formula.³⁴ Indeed, Paul appears to have maintained this politic silence until 645, when he dispatched that portentous letter to Theodore, after the continuous provocation of the pope and his *apocrisiarii*, defending the 'one will' (although in terms, as set out below, which far from conform to the caricature of monothelete doctrine circulated by its opponents).³⁵

The danger, from the Constantinopolitan perspective, was that the doctrinal resistance to the *Ekthesis* might come to provide the ideological underpinning for more patent political resistance. Indeed, at some point during the late reign of Heraclius Maximus' pre-eminent patron in North Africa, the prefect George, had fallen under some political (perhaps even doctrinal) suspicion and was recalled for an audience in the capital;³⁶ although he appears to have survived his examination, late in 641 he was again involved in significant political dissent when he refused a command of the empress and regent Martina.³⁷ Soon afterwards Martina's regime collapsed, and we hear no more of George. Later in the decade we come, in a rapid succession, to Maximus' doctrinal disputation with the former Constantinopolitan patriarch Pyrrhus (at which the exarch Gregory had presided), the subsequent convocation of anti-monothelete synods in the

33 For Valentine's support for Constans in 641 see Nicephorus, *Short History* 31. For the aftermath, the failed attempt to become co-emperor and the subsequent appointment in the east, see John of Nikiu, *Chronicle* 120 (Zotenberg 217–18); and cp. Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6133. For Valentine's later rebellion see Ps.-Sebēos, *History* 44, Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6136, *Anonymous Chronicle to 1234*, 126, placed in the period 643–5. The opponents of monotheletism were not unaware of these disturbances; see Theodore Spudaeus, *Narrations* 16–17.

34 See pp. 13–14 above.

35 For the text of the letter see pp. 254–60 below, and for interpretation pp. 238–9.

36 The documents which relate to George's recall to Constantinople are: Maximus the Confessor, *Letters* 1, 16, 18, 44 and 45, all of which are, in the opinion of Booth (2013a) 254–6, misdated to 642 in Sherwood (1952). Letter 44 (PG 91. 648C) suggests that George was under some political suspicion; Letter 45 (648D–649B) a doctrinal one. George's accusers are also referred to in Letter 16 (576D–577A). On George see Booth (2013a) 110, 151–2.

37 The affair is described in Maximus the Confessor, Letter 12, and there dated to November 641. A rebellion of North Africa in this period is also suggested in John of Nikiu, *Chronicle* 120 (Zotenberg 211); George of Resh'aina's *Life of Maximus* 18.





province (the letters from which describe significant tensions with the capital),³⁸ and the exarch's subsequent secession from Constantinopolitan rule (albeit unsuccessful). The reaction from emperor and patriarch was the issuing of the *Typos*, which reiterated the irenic stance of the *Psēphos* and the *Ekthesis* in once again banning discussion of the Christological operations, but now extended that ban to discussion of the wills.³⁹ In retrospect – and in particular in light of the Palestinian perspective to which we now turn – it was perhaps a desperate initiative. In its attempt to maintain the doctrinal consensus, it was nevertheless characteristic of the Constantinopolitan stance throughout the crisis.

2. THE PALESTINIAN PERSPECTIVE

Thus far we have seen that, at the time of the Heraclian unions with various anti-Chalcedonian churches in the period 629–33, there was no pre-existent Chalcedonian consensus on the question of the operations, although the issue was a conspicuous component of neo-Chalcedonian discussion in the previous decade. Did, then, Sophronius' dissent from the *Pact of Union* in 633 arise from some preformed commitment to a 'two operations' formula within his particular circle?

A Damascene sophist who had become a monk at the Palestinian monastery of Theodosius, Sophronius had spent much of his adulthood touring the monasteries of the Roman east with his friend and fellow monk John Moschus; but during the reign of Phocas (602–10), as the Persians overran Roman Mesopotamia, the pair had fled to Antioch and thence to Alexandria.⁴⁰ Here Moschus and Sophronius are said to have engaged in various doctrinal disputations with miaphysite theologians on behalf of the Chalcedonian patriarch John the Almsgiver, a Heraclian appointee parachuted onto the Alexandrian throne during or after the emperor's

38 For the tensions between the capital and North Africa see the reported accusations referred to in the letters of the bishops of Numidia, Byzacena and Mauretania and of Victor of Carthage in Lateran Acts (pp. 163, 186 below). We must also wonder if the domestic disturbance alluded in the former, which prevented the convocation of an actual council, was not some form of domestic political rebellion; see Jankowiak (2009) 230–1; Booth (2013a) 287–8.

39 On the *Typos* and *oikonomia* see Ohme (2008) 317–21.

40 See the narrative contained in *Prologue to the Spiritual Meadow*. Sophronius' presence in Alexandria in the late reign of Phocas is implied in his *Anacreontics* 21 esp. 99–103.





usurpation of Phocas in 610 and charged, it appears, with the maintenance of the religious peace.⁴¹ There is little indication in this period, then, of Sophronius' imminent emergence as the emperor's most prominent religious critic.

We might nevertheless speculate that in this period, if not before, Sophronius had been exposed to that Aristotelian principle expressed in the corpora of contemporaneous Alexandrian philosophers, that operation was a property of nature (so that 'one operation' would imply 'one nature'). His writings of this period give little hint, however, of an outright commitment to a 'two operations' Christological formula.⁴² Indeed, Sophronius' later dissent from monoenergist doctrine is best seen not as the simple expression of a pre-formed commitment but as a position which developed within the course of the crisis itself.

We can perceive something of this process in the corpus of Sophronius' pupil and fellow Palestinian ascetic Maximus the Confessor, who, later in his career, would come to revise some of his earlier pronouncements on the Christological operations.⁴³ In the mid-640s, for example, Maximus' *Opusculum* 1 defended his earlier use, in the *Ambigua to John* (c.630), of the phrase 'one operation of God and the saints',⁴⁴ and in his *Opusculum* 9 (c.645/6) he was again forced to defend an earlier position, in this instance in Letter 19. The latter had been composed in response to Sergius' publication of the *Psēphos*, when the latter's disciple Pyrrhus (future patriarch of Constantinople) had dispatched the document to Sophronius' own disciple for comment. In response Maximus lavished praise both on his correspondent and upon the Constantinopolitan patriarch, and acclaimed the latter's retreat from the 'innovation' at Alexandria. Maximus' disquiet at monoenergism is evident: indeed, he requests that his correspondent explain the precise meaning of the Christological term 'operation' and its

41 See Leontius of Neapolis, *Life of John the Almsgiver* 5, 16, 33, 49. On John and his relationship with Moschus and Sophronius see also Usener (1907) 80–107; Chadwick (1974) 49–59; Rapp (2004). John's patriarchate was remembered as a time of peace in miaphysite circles; see Maspero (1923) 328.

42 For that principle in the thought of Alexandrian philosophers see Hovorun (2008) 108–11, 150–1, with Wolska-Conus (1989) 47–59 on Sophronius' possible association with the Alexandrian philosophical scene. On quasi-dyoenergist statements within Sophronius' *Miracles of Cyrus and John* 29.6, 37.9, 41.9 (written in 610–c.614), see Booth (2013a) 197–8.

43 For Maximus' Palestinian origins see p. 12, n. 35.

44 Maximus the Confessor, *Opusc.* 1 (PG 91. 33A-B); cp. *Ambigua to John* 3. For their dates see Sherwood (1952) 31–2, 53–5.





cognates, and wonders how ‘one operation’ could in fact be confessed.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, his praise of two proto-monotheletes and his conspicuous failure to commit himself to an outright expression of ‘two operations’ would later prove a cause of acute discomfort.⁴⁶

In the same *Opusculum* 9 Maximus defended himself against a further charge, that he had once confessed (in a ‘letter to Marinus’) three operations: that is, one at level of the union, and two at the level of the natures.⁴⁷ Maximus, of course, rejects the charge, but it might in fact relate to his earlier approach to problematic patristic passages (expressed in *Opuscula* 7 and 20 of c.640–642, both addressed to Marinus) where he had argued that certain Fathers’ use of ‘one operation’, though not supporting monoenergism, represented a requisite guard against introducing division into Christ.⁴⁸ In the same period he had stated elsewhere that a failure to embrace both ‘one operation’ and ‘two operations’ was to fall into either confusion or division – which gave grounds for his critics’ accusation that he had in fact recognised ‘three’ operations.⁴⁹ Indeed, later, after the Lateran Synod in 649, the simultaneous recognition of ‘one’ and ‘two’ operations would become the official stance of Constantinople. But Maximus’ attitude to contemporaries who adopted that position would then be far less flexible than it had been to those patristic authors who had expressed ‘one operation’.⁵⁰

These shifts in Maximus’ thought are, of course, unsurprising.⁵¹

45 Maximus the Confessor, *Opusc.* 9 (esp. PG. 91. 132 A–B); cp. Letter 19 (esp. PG 91. 592D–596B). The former was composed on Sicily, with Maximus en route to Rome from North Africa (c.645/6). Therein Maximus claims that he received also from Pyrrhus a ‘huge tome’ (132A), which Jankowiak (2009) 182–3 convincingly identifies with the ‘dogmatic tome’ of Pyrrhus in the Lateran Acts (p. 224 below).

46 Critics have tended to adopt argumentative extremes in respect of Maximus’ position in Letter 19, some suggesting that he was not perturbed at monoenergism (e.g. Lethel [1979] 59–64) and others that he here expressed the same dyoenergism which would characterise his later thought (e.g. Bathrellos [2004] 129–30). A middle position is preferable.

47 Maximus the Confessor, *Opusc.* 9 (PG 91. 125C–128B).

48 See Maximus the Confessor, *Opusc.* 7 (PG 91. 88B–89B) and 20 (PG 91. 229B–233B). Pace Sherwood (1952) 41–2, 51, but *Opusc.* 20 must post-date *Opusc.* 7 (based both on the contents and on Marinus’ titulature). Both texts nevertheless date to the period c.641–2.

49 Maximus the Confessor, *Opusc.* 8 (PG 91. 105A). For the date (c.640) see Sherwood (1952) 43–4.

50 See Maximus the Confessor, *Letter to Anastasius the Disciple*; also Anastasius Disciple, *Letter to the Monks of Cagliari*. Both letters date to 658; for the context see Booth (2013a) 320–2.

51 See the fuller account in Bathrellos (2004) 195–208.





But they nevertheless serve to underscore a crucial point which applies as much to Maximus as to his master Sophronius: that the doctrine of ‘two operations’ which both propounded was refined over an extended period of time. Moreover, it is clear that it became more intransigent as time progressed. Thus, for example, where Sophronius and Maximus had at first embraced the principle of doctrinal silence (in the *Psēphos*), both soon abandoned it;⁵² and Maximus, though earlier able to countenance the qualified use of ‘one operation’, soon rejected it altogether. The ‘two operations’ position, therefore, both started from an uncertain patristic basis and developed over time. It therefore demands contextualisation. Indeed, the need to comprehend the broader contexts which informed the crisis becomes all the more pressing when we consider that the two contested doctrines were, in fact, not so distinct: both sides adhered to the Council of Chalcedon, admitted that a single Christ did both divine and human things, and thought in terms of theandric (i.e. divine–human) acts. The difference between them was essentially a question of emphasis, with the monoenergists protesting against Nestorianism and the dyoenergists against monophysitism.⁵³

How, then, can we explain the strong dissent of Sophronius and his Palestinian faction? One emphatic difference between Sophronius and his opponents was a question less of doctrine than of doctrinal politics – namely, the maintenance of strict sacramental and liturgical boundaries between Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian Christians. Thus in his *Miracles of Cyrus and John* (610–c.614) Sophronius demonstrated an acute concern with the exclusion of miaphysite heretics from the orthodox eucharist.⁵⁴ In the *Life of John the Almsgiver* which he and Moschus prepared for their former patron’s funeral in 620, Sophronius celebrated the patriarch’s suppression of the miaphysite addition ‘who was crucified for us’ to the Trisagion;⁵⁵ and soon after (in the period c.630–633) Sophronius sent to the

52 For the denunciation of doctrinal silence within Maximus’ circle see e.g. *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91. 300C, 305D–308A); *Record of the Trial* 4; *Disputation at Bizye* 3, 12.

53 So Price (2010), and pp. 87–90 below.

54 See Sophronius, *Miracles of Cyrus and John* 36–9 (cp. also *ibid.* 12); with Booth (2013a) 76–9. Cp. Leontius of Neapolis, *Life of John the Almsgiver* 49. We should also note that Sophronius’ position towards heretics in the *Miracles* is far more moderate than in his later output: explicit mention of Chalcedon appears in but one tale – *Miracles* 39.5, with a further reference in the additional Latin text at PG 87. 3574A – and at *Miracles* 39.11 he even apologises for his failure to expand upon the theme. For this relative moderation see Schönborn (1972) 66 n. 47, and Flusin (1992) 65.

55 See *Anonymous Life of John the Almsgiver* 5; *Epitome of the Life of John the*





archbishop Arcadius of Cyprus a letter which criticised his toleration of the same addition.⁵⁶

Sophronius' precise opinions on the Christological operations pre-633 cannot be recovered, but his status as a sacramental and liturgical rigorist can nevertheless be seen to condense a fundamental point of divergence with his future opponents: that is, the extent to which rigour (liturgical or doctrinal) – or, rather, *akribeia* ('precision'), as opposed to the aforementioned *oikonomia* ('accommodation') – should be sacrificed for the sake of broader communion. (Indeed, from various texts we learn that the above-mentioned Arcadius was or would become a principal supporter of the monoenergist initiative and an explicit advocate of *oikonomia*.)⁵⁷ Within Sophronius' circle we witness a distinct and ever-deepening commitment to the eucharist and to eucharistic communion as the central expression of the Chalcedonian faith, and thus also to the protection of both the sacrament and its rites from heretical intrusion or pollution: witness, for example, the various tales associated with the eucharist in Moschus' *Spiritual Meadow* (c.630),⁵⁸ or the unprecedented monastic commentary on the Divine Liturgy contained within Maximus the Confessor's *Mystagogy* of around the same date.⁵⁹ Although in its original context that deepening emphasis seems also to have been driven by a desire to assert the Church's elevation above the shifting sands of political caprice in a period of profound crisis, in the coming decades it would come also to provide a significant complement to the doctrinal dissent of Sophronius and his allies, which continued to

Almsgiver 5. These texts derive from a lost *Life* of the patriarch by Moschus and Sophronius. Thus at *ibid.* 16 (Lappa-Zizicas 278) 'John and Sophronius' dedicate the text to the patriarch as a funeral oration, suggesting that it was performed in November 620; for this date see Déroche (1995) 118.

⁵⁶ Sophronius, *Letter to Arcadius* esp. 2 and 33–54. For the date see Brock (1973) 322. For the place of the Trisagion within the wider crisis see Booth (2013a) 239 n. 55.

⁵⁷ See Cyrus of Alexandria, *First Letter to Sergius* (ACO² II/2, 588); Sergius of Constantinople, *First Letter to Cyrus* (*ibid.* 528); Agapius, *Universal History* (Vasiliev 467); with Jankowiak (2009) 139–42.

⁵⁸ See Booth (2013a) 131–8. The date is approximate. Moschus appears to have arrived in Rome in the late 620s, but had died before September 634 (*ibid.* 110–11, 232 n. 21).

⁵⁹ *Ibid.* 173–84. Note also the distinct sacramental and liturgical emphasis in Sophronius' patriarchal sermons – with Olster (1994) 99–115 – and of the so-called *Georgian Appendix to the Spiritual Meadow*, the product perhaps of an unknown disciple of Moschus; for the latter see Booth (2013a) 329–33. In terms of the circle's commitment to sacramental rigour (and its opinions on the emperor), see also the hostile reaction of Maximus to Heraclius' forced baptism of Jews in 632, in the conclusion to Letter 8 in Devreesse (1937); with Booth (2013a) 170–1.





demand the strict segregation of heretics from communion, and which lurched ever more towards an assertion of the Church's independence from the secular realm.

In the light of this, we might well have predicted Sophronius' reaction upon hearing of Heraclius' unprecedented programme of ecclesial reunification, in which the emperor himself is said to have received communion from the hands of such diverse persons as the catholicos of the Armenians and that of the Nestorians. Even before Sophronius' public challenge to monoenergism, moreover, there are signs that the emperor's ecumenical initiative had caused disquiet amongst his Palestinian monastic contemporaries. Before Heraclius' restoration of the Cross to Jerusalem, the archimandrite Antiochus Monachus reports that rumours of his imminent union with Athanasius the Camel-driver, the miaphysite patriarch of Antioch, had 'caused considerable disturbance' in Jerusalem and its surrounding monasteries.⁶⁰ After his subsequent sojourn in Jerusalem in March 630, moreover, Heraclius had elevated the patriarchal *locum tenens* Modestus (archimandrite of Moschus and Sophronius' coenobium of Theodosius) to the patriarchate, but soon afterwards he died (or, perhaps, was poisoned) and the throne of Jerusalem was left vacant until Sophronius' accession late in 634.⁶¹ The patriarchal interregnum appears to indicate significant tensions: indeed, later anti-monothelete sources would remember that interregnum as one of 'irregular' consecrations carried out under another *locum tenens*, Sergius of Joppa, whom opponents regarded as an illegitimate imperial stooge.⁶²

We observed above the Constantinopolitan rhetoric of triumph and restoration which accompanied Heraclius' programme of ecclesial reunion. But in this context it is of considerable interest to note the relative caution with which both Sophronius and Maximus greeted the emperor's achievement. For Sophronius this was a distinct shift of emphasis, for soon after the Persian capture of Jerusalem he had composed an anacreontic

60 Antiochus Monachus, *Pandects* 130 (PG 89:1, 1843B–C), and above p. 7 for the attempted union.

61 For the elevation of Modestus: Strategius, *On the Fall* 24; Eutychius, *Annals (Alexandrian Recension)* (Breydy 129); *Translation of the Relics of Anastasius the Persian* (Flusin 101). For his death see the Georgian and Arabic variations of Strategius, *On the Fall* 24 (Garitte, *Prise* vol. 2, 55, and *Expugnationis ... Recensiones* 56, 104–5, 191); and cp. Eutychius, *Annals (Alexandrian Recension)* (Breydy 130–1).

62 See Lateran Acts (p. 148 below); Pope Martin, *Letter to John of Philadelphia* (PL 87, 159A–B). Cp. also idem, *Letter to Pantaleon* (PL 87, 172B–D).





poem in which he cast the Persians as the barbaric agents of the devil and called for the sanctified violence of the pious Christian empire soon to descend upon them.⁶³ In a later poem composed to commemorate the restoration of the Cross to Jerusalem (630), however, Sophronius delighted in the end of Persian occupation – here conceived, we should note, not as the triumph of demonic will but rather as divine punishment for collective Christian sin – but nevertheless moved away from the imperialist rhetoric of the earlier piece, reducing the emperor's role to a single passing reference and attributing Khusrau's death and the Persian reversals to the power of the Cross itself.⁶⁴ In a letter dispatched to a correspondent in the capital in c.629, Maximus too exulted in the 'news of a peace on earth', but nevertheless warned against a retreat into a fondness 'for the world and its ruler' and called for a renewal of that war against the passions which had fomented divine anger in the first place.⁶⁵ In both Sophronius and Maximus, therefore – in telling contrast to their Constantinopolitan contemporaries – we discover only muted celebrations of the Roman restoration and in particular of the emperor's role within it. We should remember, perhaps, that as refugees the pair had experienced more than most the effects of imperial failure in the 610s and 620s, and thus had good reason to react to claims of peace and victory with caution.⁶⁶ But this caution was nevertheless consistent with the dominant paradigm through which Christian reversals had come to be explained, for if collective Christian sin was the cause of divine anger, then collective purification had to be its solution. From this perspective, therefore, the grand political 'restoration' proclaimed by Heraclius remained to be seen.

Constantinopolitan court rhetoric had countered this same problem through casting Heraclius in the role of grand redeemer. But in a further letter, perhaps composed in the same period, Maximus had set out a notable counterpoint to that same emphasis. A Constantinopolitan correspondent had asked him to explain God's ordinance that some men rule other men,

⁶³ Sophronius, *Anacreontics* 14.

⁶⁴ Ibid. 18. For this ambivalent attitude to Heraclius see Flusin (1992) vol. 2, 318; Booth (2013a) 160–2.

⁶⁵ Maximus the Confessor, Letter 24 (PG 91. 608C–609A). The letter is repeated *verbatim* at Letter 42, and is addressed to either John Cubicularius or Constantine Sacellarius (or both).

⁶⁶ This too is the implication of Maximus the Confessor, Letters 8, 28 and 30, all composed c.632 (for the date and the separate correspondents see Booth (2013a) 163–7). There in Maximus asks for his correspondents' reassurance that the barbarian threat has in fact dissipated (e.g. PG 91. 445A).





and Maximus offered the standard Christian response that the maintenance of good order on earth counteracts the disorder introduced through the Fall, and that the emperor who preserves divine law is God's pious vicegerent on earth. Yet Maximus' mirror for princes also explores the converse of that vision. The emperor who ignores the divine commandments, he claims, will ignore all counsel, appoint the wicked as the lords of his domain, and drag the entire realm down to destruction.⁶⁷ In this perspective, therefore, the condition of the empire and of its inhabitants is cast as the moral barometer of the emperor himself. As such, for some observers at least, the looming crisis of empire might fast become a comment on its ruler.

The intellectual elements which comprised Sophronius' dissent had long been in formation: an intimate knowledge of the doctrinal scene at Alexandria and considerable experience in debating with its miaphysite communities; the commitment to Chalcedonian doctrine and to the strict sacramental differentiation of orthodox and heretic; and a Christological preference, perhaps, for 'two operations' over 'one'. But it was the emergence of the armies of Islam from the Arabian peninsula which appears at last to have completed Sophronius' disillusionment, revealing as vapid imperial claims to divine favour, and refocusing previous explanations of the crisis from notions of collective sin to the heretical doctrine of Constantinople. Thus it was that, as the armies of the first caliph Abū Bakr pressed upon Roman Palestine (from c.633), Sophronius launched a prominent public opposition to the emperor and the ecumenical patriarch, focusing his dissent on the 'one operation' proclaimed within the neo-Chalcedonian concord agreed at Alexandria. This is not to claim, of course, that the doctrinal issues were in effect meaningless, a rhetorical gloss on more 'real' motivations. It is instead to recognise that perceptions of doctrinal deviation and the decision to mount a doctrinal opposition were informed as much through a belief that divine favour in the political sphere depended on orthodox doctrine as through inherited Christian dogma. Just as the unions of c.629–33 cannot be separated from the context of Heraclius' triumph over Persia, so too the Palestinian opposition cannot be appreciated apart from the charged and shifting context in which it was articulated. In both cases doctrinal, sacramental and political conceptions all interwove.

It should not come as a surprise, then, that as the crisis of empire deepened so too did the dissent of Sophronius and his Palestinian faction.

⁶⁷ Maximus the Confessor, Letter 10 (addressed to John Cubicularius), with Sahas (2003) 110–11.





Despite accepting the terms of the *Psēphos*, after his election as patriarch of Jerusalem late in 634 Sophronius renewed his opposition, and soon precipitated the aforementioned council on Cyprus. The subsequent publication of the *Ekthesis* in 636, and the death of Sophronius soon after, appear to have encouraged a brief moratorium on discussion. Constantinople's consistent disavowal of monoenergism no doubt undermined continued opposition, and Sophronius' death left his disciples without a patriarchal mouthpiece. The doctrinal *volte face* at Rome – which had occurred after the death of Pope Honorius late in 638, and in a context of significant pressure applied through Maximus and his Palestinian allies – was thus a crucial diplomatic coup, and allowed Maximus from c.640 to relaunch the resistance to Constantinopolitan doctrine, now refocused on the *Ekthesis*' assertion of 'one will' (in fact tangential to the document's actual purpose, as we have seen).

As we noted above, discussion on Christ's will(s) in preceding centuries had been meagre. There can be little doubt that Maximus, in expounding a developed doctrine of Christ's human will, was making a substantial departure from previous patristic discussion of the subject. Nevertheless, it is important that we do not consider that departure as a mere political machination, designed to frustrate the imperial position yet again: once developed, Maximus' doctrine provided a compelling solution to a genuine Christological problem; and, moreover, it condensed thoughts that had for some time been evident, if implicit, in his output.⁶⁸ Thus in two texts which long precede the *Ekthesis* in 636 – the *Questions to Thalassius* and the *Exposition on the Lord Prayer* – Maximus expounded a Christological position which in fact predicts his later doctrine of the two natural wills in Christ (one human, one divine), even if that doctrine remains implicit.⁶⁹ The lack of explicitness here, however, belies the temptation to lurch to the opposite interpretative extreme and to regard Maximus' Christological thought as somehow immune to change. Indeed, in the same texts the undeveloped nature of his thought is demonstrated in the application of *gnōmē* ('purpose') and *proairesis* ('choice') to Christ in a positive sense, in

68 For Maximus on the will (the literature on which is extensive) see pp. 96–9 below, and also Bausenhardt (1992) 110–82; Larchet (1996) 221–382; Bathrellos (2004) 99–174.

69 See e.g. Maximus the Confessor, *Questions to Thalassius* 21 (Laga and Steel vol. 1, 129.49–50); 42 (Laga and Steel vol. 1, 285–9); 61 (Laga and Steel vol. 2, 95.187), with Larchet (1996) 231–43; *Exposition on the Lord's Prayer* 135–9, 148–53, 159–64, with Bathrellos (2004) 150–1; Berthold (2010). Sherwood (1952) 31 and 34 dates the texts to the period c.628–34, although the *terminus post quem* might be much earlier.





contrast to his later position;⁷⁰ and his general inattentiveness to the problem of monotheletism is demonstrated in his use, throughout this earlier period, of 'single will' and 'one will' in reference to man's reconciliation to God.⁷¹ These statements together point to the same general conclusion that we reached in respect of the 'two operations': that the doctrine of the 'two wills' drew from existing principles but was nevertheless developed and refined within the context of Maximus' opposition.

There can be little doubt that the same opposition, like that of Sophronius, was informed by the continuing crisis of empire and its perceived causes. Indeed, it is ironic that the continued Roman reversals which spurred the repeated attempts by Constantinople to appease its doctrinal critics seem also to have sharpened Palestinian perception of the capital's doctrinal error. But this same faction also now realised that their personal and doctrinal fates depended upon the continuous support of the Roman popes, whose abrogation of monotheletism and support for the doctrinal resistance had saved it from irrelevance. This inspired a distinctly pro-Roman rhetoric in Maximus' output of the 640s, as the fates of his Palestinian faction and the Roman popes became ever more closely intertwined. Around 641 he composed a defence of Pope Honorius' orthodox credentials in his *First Letter to Sergius*, arguing that the pope's 'one will' had in fact designated the divine will (and indeed, in a desperate addendum, that he had not stated 'one will' in the first place);⁷² and, later in the same decade, he composed from Carthage a letter in which he defended, against detractors at Constantinople, Pope Theodore's use of the *Filioque* formula (that is, the Latin doctrine that the Spirit proceeds both from the Father 'and the Son').⁷³ At the same time, throughout this decade Maximus in several texts celebrated Roman pre-eminence within

70 See Maximus the Confessor, *Exposition on the Lord's Prayer* 135–9 and *Questions to Thalassius* 42 (Laga and Steel vol. 1, 7.285–9). Maximus would later retract the earlier use of *proairesis* in the latter; see Maximus the Confessor, *Opusc.* 1 (PG 91. 29D–31A); for the change on *gnōmē* see *Opusc.* 16 (PG 91. 192A, 193A). For the undeveloped nature of Maximus' thought on *gnōmē* and *proairesis* in the earlier period see e.g. Larchet (1996) 241–3; Bathrellos (2004) 149–51.

71 See Maximus the Confessor, *Exposition on the Lord's Prayer* 111–15 and 181–2; Letter 2 (PG 91. 396C, 401B); *Opusc.* 18 (PG 91. 213B).

72 See Maximus the Confessor, *Opusc.* 20 (PG 91. 237C–244A), and for the claim that 'one will' had been falsified in Constantinople *ibid.* 244C–D. For the date see Jankowiak (2009) 185 n. 94; also (2013). For discussion of Maximus' defence of Honorius see esp. Larchet (1998c) 128–33; and *cp.* *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91. 328B–329C).

73 Maximus the Confessor, *Opusc.* 10 (PG 91. 133B–137C). For the location at Carthage





the Christian Church, and acknowledged three distinct bases for it: Rome's status as the guardian of the orthodox faith, its inheritance through the promise of Christ to St Peter (Matt 16:18–19) and its recognition in canonical decrees.⁷⁴ Although the most effusive texts are extant only in Latin – and excerpted in medieval papal circles for their pro-Roman content – there is little reason to suspect falsification, for a wider selection of sources from within Maximus' circle (including the Acts of the Lateran Synod) repeats the same pro-Roman rhetoric.⁷⁵ Maximus cannot, of course, be considered a proto-champion of the later, monarchic claims of the post-Gregorian popes: the principal criterion for Rome's pre-eminence remained its commitment to orthodox doctrine.⁷⁶ But although the Palestinian allies of Maximus had much to gain by upholding long-standing papal claims to special status – which reinforced its own doctrinal stance while also challenging the right of the eastern authorities to intervene in matters of the faith – their pro-Roman rhetoric in this period did not represent some gross deviation from their earlier output. It was instead a further extension of that previous emphasis on eucharistic communion as the inviolable bedrock of divine illumination, irrespective of reversals within the terrestrial sphere.⁷⁷ From this earlier position, it was but a short leap into an assertion of ecclesial independence which complemented the rhetoric of Rome.

Around 645/6 Maximus himself travelled from North Africa to Rome, where he resided in a monastic house at Cella Nova, soon to be renamed in honour of the Palestinian pioneer St Sabas.⁷⁸ Soon after, the western resistance to Constantinople entered a dramatic new phase. As we have

see *ibid.* 137B, and for the date (c.645) Sherwood (1952) 53–5. On Maximus and the *Filioque* see e.g. Siecienski (2010) 78–86.

74 See esp. Maximus the Confessor, *Letter to Thalassius*; *Opusc.* 12. For the date of the former (c.640) see Sherwood (1952) 43; of the latter (645) see Boudignon (2007) 256 n. 22. Both texts are preserved in the *Collectanea* of Anastasius Bibliothecarius; see PL 129. 573–6, 583–6, with Neil (2006a) 71–9.

75 See esp. Lateran Acts (pp. 144 and 153 below). Nor, it should be said, is this pro-Roman rhetoric a creation of the 640s, for it is present in Moschus' *Spiritual Meadow* (see Booth (2013a) 111–15, 129–30) and in Sophronius, *Synodical Letter* 2.5.4.

76 See esp. Larchet (1998c); *contra* e.g. Riou (1973) 206–12; Garrigues (1976).

77 See Cooper (2005) 189–90; Booth (2013a) 274–6.

78 For Maximus' retreat to Rome see above p. 15. For his residence at Cella Nova see George of Resh'aina, *Life of Maximus* 19, 24. For its rededication to St Sabas see Sansterre (1983) vol. 1, 22–31; Coates-Stephens (2006) 223–31, and for the argument that Moschus once resided there Booth (2013a) 111–15.





seen, it appears that Maximus – who had spent much of his adult life as a refugee from the Roman east – had never admired the regime of Heraclius, even in its finest hour. But from the time of Sophronius' protest at Alexandria he became associated with several significant moments of political rebellion: in a text associated with his later trial in the capital it is alleged that in 633 he advised Peter general of Numidia (later North African exarch, and a known associate of Maximus) not to support the heretical regime of Heraclius;⁷⁹ and late in 641, as we have seen, Maximus' own correspondence indicates his involvement in the North African eparch George's refusal of a command from the regent Martina.⁸⁰ These, perhaps, were minor events, and might have gone unnoticed in the capital. But events in North Africa in the period 645–7 – which witnessed the exarch Gregory's presidency of Maximus' disputation with Pyrrhus at Carthage and his subsequent rebellion against Constantinople – could not be ignored. Observers in the capital believed Maximus to be the *éminence grise* of the North African rebellion, and in his later trial literature he is accused of giving active encouragement to the exarch (a claim which he does not there refute).⁸¹ At the least, he had provided the rebellion with a distinct ideological prop and, while modern critics have tended to defend and to regard the later accusations as pure political scapegoating, his consistent association with political dissidence (which continues in the aftermath of the Lateran Synod) is too consistent to be coincidental.⁸² At this point, the Palestinian dissent had moved from doctrinal resistance to conspicuous support for regime change.

For Maximus and his Palestinian colleagues, the failure of the exarch's rebellion no doubt underlined once again the crucial importance of papal support. Such support continued to provide them with a crucial medium through which to express their doctrinal dissent; but in the context of Muslim expansion along the North African littoral it also provided them with a further western refuge and a source of patronage. Indeed, it is evident that Rome was now providing a home for an ever-widening stream of Palestinian exiles; at some point between 620 and 633 Sophronius' master John Moschus had retreated to Rome, and was to prove something

79 See *Record of the Trial* 1. For Peter's career see Duval (1971), and for his distinction from Peter Illustis Zuckerman (2002a). One *patrikos* Peter, who appears to be the North African exarch, was the recipient of Maximus' *Comptus Ecclesiasticus* (640/1).

80 See above p. 26.

81 See *Record of the Trial* 2.

82 See e.g. Haldon (1985) 89; Sahas (2003) 110–16. Cp. Booth (2013a) 309.





of a pioneer.⁸³ The Lateran Acts report that during the synod's second session a delegation of eastern monks resident in Rome submitted an anti-monothelete petition to the assembled bishops. Those monks are said to have represented several monasteries: the Laura of St Sabas in Palestine, a satellite of that same institution in North Africa and two communities of Armenians and Cilicians (perhaps, however, also comprised of ascetics from Palestine).⁸⁴ These, however, appear as a subsection of a larger Palestinian presence, including ascetics from St Theodosius', Sophronius' former coenobium.⁸⁵ The Roman popes, therefore, now provided Maximus' Palestinian faction both with a patriarchal mouthpiece for its doctrine and with the basic patronage which granted them their maintenance. At the same time as Pope Theodore was attempting to extend papal power into Palestine, Palestinians were an ever more conspicuous – and influential – presence in Rome.

This coincidence of papal and Palestinian agendas found its most potent expression in the convocation of the Lateran Synod in the late 640s. For the pope and the western bishops, the participation of the Palestinian faction on the one hand added to the meeting a sense of ecumenicity; on the other, it also provided the Greek theological expertise required for the detailed refutation of monoenergism and monotheletism. (As we shall see, Maximus and allies in fact had a profound influence upon the preparation of the Acts of the Lateran Synod.)⁸⁶ Considered from the perspective of Constantinople, however, the Palestinian alliance with Rome represented something far greater than the confluence of western and eastern doctrinal agendas. For besides the prop which the anti-monothelete resistance

83 See *Prologue to the Spiritual Meadow*, with Louth (1998) *contra* Follieri (1988).

84 Lateran Acts (pp. 150–1 below). Cp. the list of signatories to the petition, extant in Latin, see *ibid.* pp. 154–6. That the Armenians and Cilicians also came from Palestine, via North Africa, is argued in Boudignon (2007). Both communities appear to have had significant ties to Maximus and his circle; see Booth (2013a) 298–9.

85 From other sources we know of some specific Palestinian ascetics present in Rome at or around the council: three named monks of Theodosius who accompanied Stephen of Dora (Pope Martin, *Letter to John of Philadelphia* [PL 87. 154B, 162A]; *Letter to George of St Theodosius* [PL 87. 167B]); two named monks of St Sabas in Africa (Martin, *Letter to the Church of Carthage* [PL 87. 147C–D]); and Theodore Spudaeus and his brother Theodosius of Gangra, later chroniclers of the dyotheletes post-655 (Theodore Spudaeus, *Hypomnesticum* (Greek) 10, with Booth (2013a) 302). To these we can perhaps add the name of Theodore of Tarsus, future archbishop of Canterbury, and a known associate of Sophronius and Maximus; see *ibid.* 114–15, 294 n. 71.

86 See pp. 62 and 99–100 below.





presented to potential political rebels, the Palestinian faction considered here had, over several decades, developed an intellectual agenda which – in its celebration of Rome and simultaneous suspicion of secular interference in the Church – provided a striking complement to the ecclesiological and political claims of the popes, which had long presented a challenge to the imperial culture of Constantinople. The Lateran Synod was, in itself, an act of gross defiance against the imperial will; but it also expressed a dangerous concurrence through which, in a context of mounting Christian reversals, both westerners and easterners had come to offer a profound ideological challenge to established notions of the relationship between church and state.

3. THE ROMAN PERSPECTIVE

The role of the papacy in the monothelite controversy raises important questions of its involvement in the empire and its position as leader of the universal church. The controversy underlines both the importance of relations between the popes and the emperor and the tensions arising from them. Papal policy over monoenergism and monothelitism was not static and unchanging, and the papal position changed considerably from the time of Patriarch Sergius' first letter to Pope Honorius in 634/5 to the convocation of the Lateran synod. While it is clear that the followers of Sophronius and Maximus played a leading part in influencing papal actions and in the work of the Lateran synod, the popes should not be seen simply as their agents.

The involvement of successive popes in the controversy reflected the position of the Roman church as leader of the universal church and the special prestige of Rome in matters of doctrine articulated in ideas of papal primacy.⁸⁷ Peter's confession of faith at Matthew 16:18–19 was the basis for the idea that the popes had a special authority in matters of doctrine and teaching because they had gained their understanding through St Peter directly from Christ. This primatial position was acknowledged throughout the eastern and western churches and, while there could be tensions, Constantinople recognised that in upholding orthodoxy the Roman church was but fulfilling its duty. However, this did not mean that in the east papal

⁸⁷ Maccarone (1991), Demacopoulos (2013), Schatz (1992)), and, on seventh-century uses of papal primacy, Conte (1971 and 1991); Schönborn (1975).





pronouncements on matters of doctrine were regarded as automatically definitive and necessitating acceptance.⁸⁸

Papal prestige was enhanced by the growing importance of Rome as a centre of martyr cults and as a place of pilgrimage. In the sixth and seventh centuries popes devoted very considerable resources to the enrichment of the churches there and to the promotion of the relic cults of the early Christian martyrs in Rome.⁸⁹ At St Peter's, for example, Pope Gregory the Great (590–604) remodelled the shrine of St Peter, inserting a ring crypt which allowed better access for pilgrims.⁹⁰ Pope Honorius (625–638) was particularly active in the promotion of relic cults, establishing, for instance, a new and lavish church on the Via Nomentana over the tomb of St Agnes.⁹¹ John IV (640–642) and Theodore (642–649) both translated martyr relics to papal churches.⁹² These shrines and churches attracted a flow of pilgrims from across Christendom, from both west and east.⁹³ Relic cults heightened the prestige of the popes who promoted them, and highlighted Rome's apostolic inheritance and primatial status through its possession of the remains of St Peter. When Pope Theodore set out ritually to depose Patriarch Pyrrhus after the latter's return to monotheletism, he was said to have done so at the tomb of Peter, an act which underlined his own exercise of apostolic authority, connecting it directly with the living presence in his tomb of the prince of the Apostles.⁹⁴

The popes also held specific responsibilities and powers as leaders of the church in Italy and in what may be called the western patriarchate, meaning those provinces where the popes exercised an immediate jurisdiction similar to that of the eastern patriarchs in their regions. Here the jurisdiction of the pope extended over territories both within the Byzantine Empire and outside it. Their authority was exercised not only in Italy and in the west but also over the imperial territories of Illyricum and North Africa.⁹⁵ Italy itself was fragmented in terms of political authority:

⁸⁸ Schatz (1992) 80–1, 96–9.

⁸⁹ Thacker (2013).

⁹⁰ *Liber pontificalis* 66. 113, trans. Davis (2000), 63.

⁹¹ *Liber pontificalis* 72. 119–20, trans. Davis (2000), 66, Brandenburg (2005) 240–7.

⁹² *Liber pontificalis* 74. 124 and 75. 128, trans. Davis (2000), 68 and 70, Mackie (2003), 216–30; Davis-Weyer (1989).

⁹³ See, for example, the pilgrim itineraries in Valentini and Zucchetti (1940–53) II, 155–207.

⁹⁴ *Liber pontificalis* 75. 127, trans. Davis (2000) 69; *Synodicon Vetus* 138; Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6121, ed. De Boor, 331.

⁹⁵ Kane (1949); Azzara (2002); Delogu (2000) 199–200.





the sixth-century Lombard invasions and conquests had taken control of territories in the north, where the kingdom of the Lombards was situated. Two separate Lombard duchies, Spoletum and Beneventum, had also been established in central and southern Italy. These newly established states left imperial authority on the peninsular of Italy fragmented: the seat of imperial government lay at Ravenna and imperial territories were linked to Rome and the south only by a narrow corridor of territory. The Mediterranean islands, including the important imperial territories of Sicily and Sardinia, were still subject to the rule of the emperor.⁹⁶ Papal jurisdiction stretched over the barbarian successor states which had been established in the provinces of the former western empire, including Visigothic Spain and Francia and the newly evangelised Anglo-Saxon kingdoms.

The responses of the popes to imperial religious policy could lead to tensions with regard to their authority in Italy and the west. For example, in the Three Chapters controversy, when Pope Vigilius (537–555) was coerced into confirming the decisions of the Council of Constantinople, convened by the emperor Justinian in 553, he was accused by some in the west for betraying Chalcedon and Pope Leo's Tome.⁹⁷ A profound and long-lasting schism occurred in Italy, particularly in the north, where religious differences in the province of Aquileia were exacerbated by Lombard conquest of territory, dividing the church between bishops in opposition to the fifth ecumenical council in Lombard territory and those faithful to the Roman church in imperial territory.⁹⁸ The Irish monk Columbanus (then in Italy) wrote on behalf of the Lombard king to Pope Boniface IV (608–615) accusing him of adopting a heretical position.⁹⁹

The monoenergist and monothelete controversies arose in the context of political and religious developments in the eastern empire. Papal authority was involved from an early stage because of its doctrinal authority, its position within the empire and its duty to impose imperial decrees within its jurisdiction. While some have seen the seventh century as a period of papal disengagement from the empire when the papacy increasingly shifted its focus to the western kingdoms and states, papal responses as

96 Zanini (1998) 33–89; Wickham (1981) 28–47.

97 For the Three Chapters controversy see Price (2009); Chazelle and Cubitt (2007).

98 Sotinel (2007) 85–120.

99 Columbanus, *Epistulae*, V, ed. Walker, 36–57, and see Gray and Herren (1994); Wood (2007) 238–9.





the crisis unfolded embraced both west and east.¹⁰⁰ Recent scholarship has affirmed the close and enduring bond between the popes and the emperors in the seventh century.

The papacy and the empire

The papacy and the city of Rome were integral parts of the Empire. Rome was an imperial city and subject to the authority of imperial officials appointed by the exarchs of Ravenna.¹⁰¹ As bishops of the city, the popes were involved in the maintenance of its fabric and its welfare, and had taken on responsibilities formerly belonging to secular administration, such as the provision of grain to the poor.¹⁰² The pope's pastoral oversight of his far-flung church required the support and assistance of imperial officials, and the maintenance of the papal patrimonies (the Roman church's landed endowment spread across Africa, Gaul, Sardinia, Italy and Sicily) necessitated negotiations with imperial subjects and functionaries.¹⁰³ The pope himself could not be consecrated without approval from the emperor.¹⁰⁴

The pontificate of Gregory the Great (590–604) illustrates the close relationship between empire and papacy around the year 600.¹⁰⁵ His pontificate is important for our understanding of papal reactions to the monoenergist and monothelete controversy not only because of its wealth of texts, contrasting starkly with the first three decades after his death, where papal letters in particular are scarce, but also because his three immediate successors had served under him in administration or on missions, while both they and the later Pope Honorius consciously continued the tradition of their master.

Gregory had served as papal *apocrisiarius* in Constantinople before his election to the papacy in 590 and had formed long-lasting relationships there with important churchmen, including the patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria, and with the imperial family.¹⁰⁶ He not

100 For disengagement see Noble (1995) 69, 80–1 and (2001) 199; for the importance of the empire see Markus (1981); Humphries (2007); Delogu (2000).

101 Delogu (2000) 199, Humphries (2007).

102 Noble (1995) 77–8; Markus (1997) 121–4; Brown (2012) 462–8.

103 See, for example, Gregory's activities described by Markus (1997) 112–21.

104 *Liber pontificalis* 81. 146 trans. Davis (2000) 79, *Liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum* ed. Foerster (1958) 209; Humphries (2007) 55.

105 Markus (1981) 21–36; Humphries (2007).

106 Markus (1997) 83–96; also Dal Santo (2013); Booth (2013c).





only enjoyed close friendships with the eastern patriarchs and others but engaged deeply in religious issues debated in the east. His *Dialogues*, for example, seek to answer questions concerning the state of the soul after death and about the miraculous powers of saints that were current in the contemporary east. This evidence of shared religious and intellectual interests and debates underlines the closeness in relations between Rome and the eastern empire.¹⁰⁷

While his correspondence as pope reveals that he could be critical of the exercise of imperial authority within the church – for example, over imperial legislation with regard to clerical and monastic recruitment or, most spectacularly, over the emperor Maurice's failure to prevent the patriarch of Constantinople using the title 'ecumenical patriarch' – he accepted the role of the emperor in the church and never saw such conflicts as representing a fundamental divide between imperial and spiritual power.¹⁰⁸ Further, Gregory expected the emperor to intervene to protect orthodoxy, if necessary with the use of coercion. Gregory's church was one where religious and secular power were profoundly integrated. Markus commented that the 'empire ... was both the major sphere of [Gregory's] activities and the permanent backdrop to all his awareness'.¹⁰⁹

Gregory's successors

The evidence of Gregory's pontificate paints a picture of a pope whose world-view was shaped by the empire and whose regular responsibilities led to close and not infrequent contact with it and its officials. The question must therefore be asked whether this remained true for his successors in the early seventh century. Here one is immediately confronted with the extreme paucity of papal letters, particularly with regard to relations with the emperors and patriarchs of Constantinople. From the death of Gregory to the accession of Pope Honorius (625–638), not a single letter between Rome and Constantinople has been preserved.¹¹⁰ However, the *Liber pontificalis* records major negotiations between popes and emperor which must have resulted in letter exchanges and documentation which no longer survive.¹¹¹ These also show that the emperor Phocas forged

107 Dal Santo (2012) 21–48.

108 Markus (1981) 21–36, esp. 22–3, Markus (1997) 83–96; Dal Santo (2013).

109 Markus (1981) 22.

110 Conte (1971) 397–12.

111 Conte (1971) nos 3, 4, 7, 8, 398–400.





good relations with Rome.¹¹² Pope Boniface III (606–607) was able to lay to rest the difficult dispute over the use of the title ‘ecumenical patriarch’ by the patriarchs of Constantinople by receiving assurance from him that the see of Rome was recognised as the head of all churches.¹¹³ His successor, Boniface IV (608–615), successfully petitioned the emperor Phocas to allow the conversion of the Pantheon into a Christian church, dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary and the martyrs; Phocas also sent gifts for the new church.¹¹⁴ In August 608 the exarch Smaragdus erected a golden statue of Phocas on a column in the Forum bearing a eulogistic inscription praising the emperor for his benefactions and for bringing peace. This celebration of Phocas in Rome corroborates the picture of harmony between the emperor and Rome and of continuity with the policies of Gregory.¹¹⁵ Amongst his successors, Popes Sabinian (604–606), Boniface III (607) and Boniface IV (608–615) had all been members of the Roman clergy and served as emissaries for Pope Gregory; Sabinian had been *apocrisiarius* in Constantinople and the two Bonifaces had been entrusted with several administrative missions.¹¹⁶ While it appears that under their successor Deusdedit (615–618) there was a backlash on the part of the Roman clergy against Gregory’s preference for selecting monks for significant tasks and positions, there is nothing to suggest that this anti-Gregorian feeling was also directed at his relations with the empire.¹¹⁷

The involvement of the papacy in the monothelete controversy should be set against this background of cooperation and respect between the emperor and Rome.¹¹⁸ Pope Honorius’ reply to Sergius’ letter of 634/5 is an affirmation of the patriarch’s letter and fits with this tradition. Honorius had been a disciple of Gregory the Great and consciously followed in his footsteps.¹¹⁹ His own relations with the emperor Heraclius were characterised by collaboration and support. Honorius, following Gregory, had

112 Humphries (2007) 53–6.

113 *Liber pontificalis* 68. 115, trans. Davis (2000) 64.

114 *Liber pontificalis* 69. 116, trans. Davis (2000) 64.

115 Claridge (1998) 84–5; Humphries (2007) 54; Coates-Stephens (2006) 150–1; Thacker (2013).

116 This information is usefully gathered together by Martyn (2004) I, 88–90; Richards (1979) 260–4.

117 Llewellyn (1974); Richards (1979) 258–65.

118 For a more negative view of papal engagement with the empire, see Jankowiak (2009) 121–8.

119 On Honorius see Thanner (1989) and Richards (1979) 179–84. For his following of Gregory see the pope’s epitaph printed by Duchesne I, 326.





worked to win over the Istrian schismatics to the imperial and catholic church. His achievements in this respect were so central to his reputation that they are celebrated in his epitaph.¹²⁰ He was supported in his efforts in Istria by Heraclius, who made a donation to compensate the church of Grado for the theft of church treasures by a schismatic bishop.¹²¹ Heraclius also made generous concessions to Honorius of Roman buildings and fabric, giving him permission to use the tiles from the temple of the *Forum Romanum* to re-roof St Peter's, and to convert the Senate House into a church.¹²²

Relations between the two patriarchs, Sergius of Constantinople and Honorius, are not recorded before Sergius dispatched his first letter to the pope. But this silence does not allow us to assume that relations were necessarily strained. The tensions generated by Gregory the Great's objections to the use of the title 'ecumenical patriarch' by the patriarchs of Constantinople seems to have been diffused by the emperor Phocas' affirmation of papal primacy.

Honorius' letter to Patriarch Sergius is famous, indeed notorious, for its statement of one will in Christ, which resulted in the pope's anathematization as a heretic at the Council of Constantinople in 681. Honorius' profession has sometimes been taken as a misguided Latin intrusion into a sophisticated Greek debate, the significance of which the western pope could not have appreciated. But this statement was but incidental in a letter the chief purpose of which was to express agreement with Sergius' prohibition of the expression of either one or two operations in Christ.¹²³ Honorius extends and elaborates on the propositions put forward by Sergius, agreeing with him in his criticism of Sophronius, whom Sergius had described as jeopardising the great gains made for orthodoxy by Cyrus of Alexandria, and repeating the position of the *Psēphos* that a single Christ is the subject of both the divine and the human acts.¹²⁴ Honorius supports Sergius' prohibition on the grounds that the expressions one or

120 Pope Honorius, *Letter to the bishops of Venetia and Istria*, PL 80. 469–70. Duchesne I, 326.

121 Thanner (1989) 93–106.

122 *Liber pontificalis* 72, trans. Davis (2000) 66–7; Thacker (2013); Richardson (1992) 409–11.

123 Pope Honorius, *First Letter to Patriarch Sergius*, ACO² II/2, 548–58; Allen (2009) 194–205.

124 Patriarch Sergius, *First Letter to Pope Honorius*, ACO² II/2, 538–40; Allen (2009) 186–9.





two operations are innovations in the faith, ‘utterances which not even synods ordained or canonical authority saw fit to clarify’.¹²⁵ He himself refuses to judge whether these expressions are correct or not, but echoes the sentiments of Sergius against hairsplitting theological argument (which the patriarch had dubbed as ‘superfluous wrangling over words’), by saying that these are matters for ‘grammarians or wordsmiths’.¹²⁶ Honorius’ rejection of defining the number of operations in Christ was intended as a defence of Chalcedon against the introduction of changes or additions to it.¹²⁷ He sets out the ‘royal road’ of Chalcedon, condemning the heretical extremes of Nestorius and Eutyches, and deploring unnecessary theological debate that can only undermine the teaching of Chalcedon.

Honorius’ statement of one will in Christ was prompted by a passage in Sergius’ letter where the patriarch, discussing how the idea of two operations could be an occasion for scandal, stated that Christ cannot possess two opposed wills. The pope builds upon Sergius’ statement, explaining how Christ’s will was not subject to conflict as human will is because his will was without sin: ‘We acknowledge one will in the Lord Jesus Christ, since manifestly our nature was assumed by the Godhead without sin in it – clearly the nature that was created before sin, not the one that was corrupted after the transgression.’¹²⁸ Christ’s sinless will did not oppose the divine will, but was in complete obedience to it. Honorius explains the conflict expressed by Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane as not indicating a real conflict of wills, but rather as intended to give an example to mankind of submission to God’s will.¹²⁹ In his affirmation of one will in Christ, Honorius sets out a monothelite position, denying that Christ possessed a human will subject to human passions. But at the time he made these statements these views were not seen as controversial. It was only when Maximus developed his own critique of the monothelite position that affirmations of one will came to be seen as incorrect.¹³⁰

In his *Second Letter to Sergius*, dispatched after the reception of Sophronius’ *Synodical Letter*, Honorius reported to the patriarch that he had written to Cyrus and Sophronius admonishing them not to use the

125 ACO² II/2, p. 554, 4–5.

126 ACO² II/2, pp. 540, 22 and 554, 15.

127 Grillmeier (1987) 136–8.

128 ACO² II/2, p. 550, 16–19.

129 For this interpretation in the patristic tradition see pp. 90–2 below.

130 See pp. 35–6 above, Booth (2013a) 239–41, 259–69; Jankowiak (2013).





expressions one or two operations.¹³¹ Nevertheless, we may note here a subtle change in his position on the Christological operations. While maintaining that ‘one Christ and Lord operates *in* both natures’ (the position of the *Psēphos* and the earlier *First Letter to Sergius*), he also demanded the confession that ‘each of the natures that are united in natural union in the one Christ operate and are active in communion with the other’ (the position of Leo’s Tome). Thus, he stated, ‘we must not define or teach either one or two operations; but instead of the one operation that some assert we must truly acknowledge that the one Christ the Lord operates in both his natures, while instead of two operations, since talk of a ‘double’ operation is forbidden, they must rather join us in teaching that the two natures ... perform their respective operations’ – a Christological position which is far closer to that of Sophronius’ *Synodical Letter*.¹³² We might imagine, therefore, that the appeals of Sophronius’ emissaries, bearing the *Synodical Letter*, had not been entirely in vain. Nevertheless, Honorius appears to have maintained his support for Sergius, sending envoys to the synod on Cyprus in 636 which refused to accept the teachings of Sophronius and Maximus.¹³³

The papal *volte face*¹³⁴

This tradition of cooperation and loyalty to the empire sets in sharp relief the change in attitude after the death of Honorius, with condemnation of the *Ekthesis* and subsequently the *Typos* by Severinus (640), John IV (640–642), Theodore (642–649) and Martin (649–655).¹³⁵ However, it is important to emphasise that papal attitudes evolved: the opposition of Severinus and John IV was not as provocative as that of Theodore and Martin. Although John and Severinus refused to accept the *Ekthesis*, they both appear to have received imperial confirmation of their elections.¹³⁶

Shortly after his consecration, John IV wrote to Heraclius’ successors,

131 Pope Honorius, *Second Letter to Patriarch Sergius*, ACO² II/2, 620–4; Allen (2009) 204–9.

132 ACO² II/2, 624. For the shift in emphasis see Schönborn (1972) 91–2; Bathrellos (2004) 180–1; Booth (2013a) 238–9.

133 Brock (1973) 316. See pp. 10–11 above.

134 The following section is much indebted to the important discussion in Jankowiak (2009) ch. 2.1, 161–220.

135 See p. 12–17 above.

136 For Severinus’ condemnation of the *Ekthesis*, see *Liber diurnus*, 128–32. Acts of 649, p. 236 below, may also refer to this condemnation. See also above p. 12 with n. 32.





his sons Constantine III and Heraclonas, to protest at the actions of Patriarch Pyrrhus in promoting the *Ekthesis*.¹³⁷ The pope had a number of interlinked aims in this letter. He wished to stop the actions of Patriarch Pyrrhus in promoting submission to the *Ekthesis* and had been alarmed in this respect by the use of Honorius' letter by Pyrrhus. He therefore needed to explain Pope Honorius' statement concerning the one will of Christ. Finally, he wished to persuade the emperors to annul the *Ekthesis*. The pope gave an account to the emperors of how Honorius' monothelete confession had arisen, claiming that Sergius had written to Honorius informing him of the monoenergist and monothelete teachings of Cyrus of Alexandria and that Honorius had rejected these. John IV explained Honorius' confession, arguing that the pope had meant that Christ had one human will because of his sinless humanity.¹³⁸ His letter was a careful and clever construction in its presentation of the role of the patriarch and emperor, avoiding implicating either Sergius or the emperor in the heresies which it censures and introducing the *Ekthesis* with no reference to its author or legislator. The decree itself is described in very vague terms as simply contravening the Tome of Pope Leo and Chalcedon.¹³⁹ John IV invokes the traditional, religious authority of the emperor, divinely appointed and entrusted with responsibility for the Christian empire. The pope's appeal to imperial authority is buttressed by reference to Constantine I and his part in safeguarding religious orthodoxy.¹⁴⁰ This was a clever move, alluding not just to the senior emperor's namesake but also implicitly to his father's identification of himself and his dynasty with the first Christian emperor.¹⁴¹ In urging the emperors to restore

137 Schacht (1936) 235–46. On this letter (which survives in three forms) and its transmission, see Winkelmann (2001) 97–9; Booth (2013a) 260–1; Azzara (1997) 180–1, 184 and 198; Magi (1972) 208–11; Van Dieten (1972) 63–4. For Pyrrhus' support of the *Ekthesis* see the decree of a synod at Constantinople under his chairmanship included in the Acts of 649, pp. 233–4 below. Cp. *Synodicon Vetus* 132 for the same synod.

138 Schacht (1936) 236–43.

139 It should be noted that in the Karshuni version of the letter translated in Schacht – and in that contained within Eutychius, *Annals (Antiochene Recension)* (Cheiko 325–32) – John offers an explicit statement of 'two wills and two operations'. However, this is absent from the extant Latin version, a retranslation from Greek by Anastasius Bibliothecarius at PL 80. 602C–607C.

140 Schacht (1936) 245. On the image of Constantine in papal letters see, for example, Gregory's Letter to King Æthelberht in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. Colgrave and Mynors II, 32, 111–15, and Azzara (1997) 126–7, 130, 138.

141 See Brandes (2001) 96–102.





orthodoxy and annul the *Ekthesis*, the pope assured them that God would reward their piety with victories over pagan peoples and with peace.¹⁴² His letter presented his complaint as arising out of the turmoil created in the western churches as a result of Pyrrhus' advocacy of the *Ekthesis*; at the same time, however, mindful of Petrine primacy, he claimed to represent the voice of the whole church.¹⁴³ John followed up this letter by convening a synod in Rome at which the patriarchs Sergius, Cyrus and Pyrrhus were anathematised.¹⁴⁴

The situation in Constantinople was transformed at this juncture by the fall of Patriarch Pyrrhus, who had championed the *Ekthesis*, but was now forced to resign as patriarch and take flight because of his political entanglements.¹⁴⁵ A response to John IV's letter came from the successor of the ill-fated Heraclonas – Constans II, who ascended the throne in November 641. It appears that his response was remarkably conciliatory: it praised the pope's orthodoxy and conceded (with clear reference to the *Ekthesis*) that the innovations introduced into the faith by the young emperor's forbears should be annulled.¹⁴⁶ By the time this letter reached Rome, John IV was dead.

What caused the shift in papal attitudes in the years after Honorius' death in 638? It is clear that determined lobbying by the Palestinian monks was crucial.¹⁴⁷ There may, however, have been more immediate grievances against Constantinople. From 636 the new Lombard king Rothari had launched an assault upon imperial holdings in the north of the Italian peninsula, and despite the successful resistance of the exarch Isaac (memorialised in his extant epitaph) had seized several towns along the western and eastern coasts.¹⁴⁸ We cannot ascertain the papal reaction, for the *Liber pontificalis* and the letters of Honorius are silent on Lombard

142 Schacht (1936) 245.

143 Ibid. 244–5, and in the Latin version PL 129. 566D.

144 *Synodikon Vetus*, ed. Duffy and Parker (1979) 114.

145 See Nicephorus, *Short History* 32; John of Nikiu, *Chronicle* (Zotenberg 217); with Booth (2013a) 252–3, 284.

146 Constans II, *Letter to Pope John IV*, Schacht (1936) 246–9. The text only survives in a single Karshuni version, but from Pope Theodore, *Letter to Paul of Constantinople* (PL 87, 78AB) it does appear that Constantinople had offered conciliation to the West. On Constans' letter see Winkelmann (2001) 102 and p. 13 above.

147 See pp. 38–40 above.

148 For these conquests see Fredegar, *Chronicle* 4.71; Paul the Deacon, *History of the Lombards* 4.45. For the epitaph (CPG IV 9869) which identifies Isaac as an Armenian, see Bertolini (1952) 118; Cosentino (1993). On Isaac see also Winkelmann (2001) 217–18.





activities in this period. The defensive effort nevertheless seems to have exhausted the public purse and to have resulted in a controversial exarchal seizure of papal monies. According to the *Liber pontificalis* in its short notice on the pontificate of Severinus (in the middle months of 640), while he was still pope-elect, one Maurice *cartularius* incited Roman soldiers to seize the Lateran Palace, spurring them on with the suggestion that Honorius had kept hidden the stipends sent to them from Constantinople. He then wrote to the exarch Isaac at Ravenna, indicating that no obstacle now impeded the plundering of the papal coffers. Isaac, therefore, came to Rome, banished all the clerics who might offer resistance to his plans and then raided the Lateran Palace, dispatching a portion of the proceeds to the emperor Heraclius.¹⁴⁹ The state's seizure of church monies – for which there are numerous precedents in Heraclius' reign – no doubt had a real economic purpose,¹⁵⁰ but it is possible that the act also served as a demonstration of imperial strength during the interim period that followed Honorius' death.

Lombard conquests and their economic consequences perhaps, therefore, brought the crisis of empire to Rome's doorstep, heightening tensions with the imperial government and encouraging the same equation of disaster and doctrine which appears to have informed the Palestinian resistance. Indeed, the awareness in Rome of the wider crisis enveloping the empire with the fall of Syria-Palestine and Egypt to Islam, and the responsibility placed on Constantinople's religious policy, are manifest in the election of Theodore as John's successor. His rapid consecration, on 24 November 642, only six weeks after his predecessor's death, does not allow time for confirmation by the emperor and probably not even by the exarch of Ravenna.¹⁵¹ Theodore is described in the *Liber pontificalis* as 'by birth a Greek, his father being a bishop from the city of Jerusalem'.¹⁵² His eastern roots were unusual for a pope at this date and his conduct with regard to monotheletism indicates close affinities and links with Maximus and his followers.¹⁵³ However, it is likely that Theodore had been a member of

149 *Liber pontificalis* 73, trans. Davis (2000), 68.

150 See Kaegi (2003) 172–3; Jankowiak (2009) 166–7.

151 See Jankowiak (2009) 204. It is noteworthy, however, that while the absence of imperial confirmation for the appointment of Martin is emphasized (see p. 83 below), this does not seem to have been raised against Theodore.

152 *Liber pontificalis* 75. 125, trans. Davis (2000) 68.

153 See Booth (2013a) 262. For the appointment of men of eastern origin to the papal see in later seventh century, see Richards (1979) 244–5; Ekonomou (2007).





the Roman clergy before his election, since papal candidates were usually selected from the Roman diaconate or from men with experience in papal service.¹⁵⁴ He was probably not a monk because of the clerical backlash against Gregory the Great's promotion of monks.¹⁵⁵

His biography in the *Liber pontificalis* provides a little more illumination about the strength of his eastern roots. It describes the translation by Theodore of the bodies of two early Christian martyrs, Primus and Felician, to the church of Santo Stefano Rotondo.¹⁵⁶ The chapel he built to house them, decorated by a splendid mosaic depicting a central jewelled cross with the two martyrs standing at either side, still survives. An inscription, now lost, attributed the decoration to Theodore, adding that he had buried his father here.¹⁵⁷ Theodore's choice of the church and his decoration of the chapel all demonstrate his attachment to Jerusalem and his eastern background. Santo Stefano Rotondo is one of the great churches of early medieval Rome and its patron was the protomartyr, put to death in Jerusalem itself. The centrally planned form of the church itself is highly unusual – in fact unique in medieval Rome – and recalls the church of the Anastasis in Jerusalem and other Palestinian churches.¹⁵⁸ Theodore's mosaic has strong eastern features, with its jewelled cross beneath a bust of Christ. Its skilled technique – for example, in the use of mixed stone and glass tesserae – points to Byzantine craftsmanship and possibly a link to Constantinople and the court of Heraclius. The workmanship is more accomplished than that at Pope Honorius' church, Sta Agnese, a little earlier.¹⁵⁹ It is suggestive of an increased Byzantine presence in Rome. Theodore's eastern orientation can also be seen in his probable introduction into the Roman calendar of new Marian feasts from the practice of the Byzantine church.¹⁶⁰

It now fell to Pope Theodore to reply to the conciliatory letter addressed to his predecessor by Constans II. He immediately proved himself to be of a very different mettle from John IV. His letters to Constantinople display an aggressive stance, uncompromisingly demanding action. Three letters of his survive from his early pontificate – one to the emperor Constans and

154 On the election of papal deacons to the pontificate, see Richards (1979) 250–65. See also Sansterre (1983) I, 20 on possible eastern infiltration into the Lateran.

155 Llewellyn (1974); Richards (1979) 256–64.

156 *Liber pontificalis* 75. 128, trans. Davis, 70, and see Duchesne, I, 334.

157 Duchesne I, 334 from De Rossi, p. II, 152.

158 Davis-Weyer (1989) 68, 71.

159 Ibid. 73–5.

160 Chavasse (1952) 30.





two others which respond to letters received from the new patriarch, Paul (641–653), and from the bishops who had consecrated him.¹⁶¹ Theodore was impatient at the failure to annul the *Ekthesis*, despite Constans' words in his letter to John IV. His anger was also triggered by the failure at Constantinople to clarify and regularise the situation by holding a synod at which Pyrrhus could be formally condemned and deposed for his 'heresy' in upholding the *Ekthesis*. This he now explicitly demanded. This insistence on the need for due procedure with regard to Pyrrhus also articulated a threat to Patriarch Paul, emphasising the irregularity of his position. Meanwhile, the compliment that Theodore in his letter to the emperor pays to 'the beautiful piety that the Holy Spirit has inspired in you' appears perfunctory.¹⁶² Nor does he hold back from condemning Heraclius by name for his promulgation of the *Ekthesis*. He emphasises the worldwide scandal caused by the *Ekthesis*, claiming that the whole world joined with him in seeking its removal. While he does not speak about papal primacy, his actions speak louder than his words: his interventions expressed the primatial role of the pope not only in safeguarding matters of doctrine but also in upholding the canons. His intransigent and antagonistic approach reflects impatience at Constantinople's failure to match words with deeds, but also (surely) a new alignment of the papacy with the uncompromising stance of the Palestinian monks. The papacy was now trying not merely to exhort the emperor and his patriarch to champion orthodoxy but to dictate to them how they were to do this.

Theodore's demands did not achieve his ends. When Patriarch Paul responded in May 645 it was to rebuke Theodore for his unmannerliness and make an affirmation of monothelism.¹⁶³ This spurred Theodore to even stronger action. When Pyrrhus arrived in Rome after his disputation with Maximus in Carthage in July 645 and made his submission to the pope, he was treated with honour as the true patriarch of Constantinople, a gross and patent challenge to imperial authority.¹⁶⁴ Soon afterwards, probably at the instigation of Theodore, two large North African councils met to condemn Constantinopolitan doctrine (in the indiction

161 Pope Theodore, *Letter to the Emperor Constans*, Schacht (1936) 249–52, *Letter to Patriarch Paul II*, PL 87. 75–80, *Letter to the bishops who consecrated the Patriarch Paul II*, PL 87. 80–2. See Winkelmann (2001) 103–6; Booth (2013a) 262; Van Dieten (1972) 80–2.

162 Schacht (1936) 250.

163 This letter is on pp. 254–60 below.

164 See *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91. 353A–B); *Liber pontificalis* 75. 127, trans. Davis (2000), 69; Theodore Spudaeus, *Narrations* 24.





year 645–6).¹⁶⁵ Theodore had now set himself on a collision course with Constantinople. When Pyrrhus retracted his dyothelete confession, Theodore anathematised him;¹⁶⁶ when Patriarch Paul continued to reject the protests of Theodore and his *apocrisarii* in Constantinople, the pope declared him deposed;¹⁶⁷ and when Paul in 647/8 issued the conciliatory *Typos*, Theodore rejected it.¹⁶⁸ If these acts were not provocative enough, in the same period he appointed Stephen of Dora papal legate in Palestine with authority to depose bishops who accepted monotheletism and the *Ekthesis*, an unprecedented papal usurpation of jurisdiction in an eastern patriarchate.¹⁶⁹ At the same time Theodore also seems to have lent his support to the revolt of the exarch Gregory (c.647), for later it was said that he had sent to North Africa news of a dream of Maximus (then in Rome) which prophesied divine support for the usurper.¹⁷⁰

It is within this context of far-reaching papal assertiveness that we should place the convocation of the Lateran Synod of 649 to give conciliar weight to the condemnation of monotheletism. Theodore must already have initiated plans for this before his death in May 649. His successor, Martin, was consecrated less than two months later in July 649, and the rift between the Roman church and the emperor was such that he was consecrated without imperial confirmation.¹⁷¹ Little is known about Martin's earlier years, but the *Liber pontificalis* tells us that he was Tuscan in origin.¹⁷² He was a senior member of the Roman clergy and had served as *apocrisarius* under Theodore.¹⁷³ He continued his predecessor's work to the extent that he may be called his imitator. He went ahead with the convocation of a synod at Rome to condemn monotheletism

165 For the lack of total African support for the Roman line see p. 135 below.

166 *Liber pontificalis* 75. 127. See also *Synodicon Vetus* 138 and Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6121.

167 *Liber pontificalis* 75. 129, trans. Davis (2000) 70. The sequencing of the *Liber pontificalis* suggests that Theodore's deposition of Paul occurred before the publication of the *Typos*.

168 For the attempt to enforce the *Typos* in the West see *Relatio motionis* 4 (Allen and Neil (2002) 54); Pope Martin, *Letter to Constans*, PL 87. 144B.

169 Acts of 649, p. 146 below, and see Booth (2013a) 295–6.

170 *Relatio motionis* 2 (Allen and Neil (2002) 50). On Maximus' involvement, see Booth (2013a) 289; Brandes (1998) 185–92 and (2001) 89–107.

171 *Liber pontificalis* 76. 130, trans. Davis (2000) 73–4. For Martin's consecration without imperial approval see Theodore Spudaeus, *Narrations* 7 and George of Resh'aina, *Life of Maximus* 21.

172 *Liber pontificalis* 76. 130, trans Davis (2000) 70.

173 Pope Theodore, *Letter to Patriarch Paul II*, PL 87. 78.





and the monothelites. In other ways, too, he followed the policy of his predecessor, for example in appointing (at the close of the Lateran Synod) a new papal representative in Palestine to succeed Stephen of Dora in the task of appointing orthodox bishops to replace those tainted with monothelitism.¹⁷⁴

Martin's service under Theodore raises the question of the involvement of the Roman clergy in events. We have charted the changing responses to the monothelite crisis from Popes Honorius to Theodore and, while individual popes undoubtedly pursued their own agendas, behind them lay the Roman church, its pastors and administrators, who also played a part in papal elections. The Roman clergy provided skilled administrators for papal business – the notaries, headed by the *primicerius*, for example, were responsible for papal correspondence and the papal library and archives. The *primicerius*, Theophylact, as we shall see, played an important role in the Lateran synod and its preparations.¹⁷⁵ The diaconate provided administrators for church affairs, including the papal *apocrisarii* at Constantinople. These could be charged with difficult negotiations and accrued important experience of the imperial court and of Constantinople. The *apocrisarii* of Severinus, for example, seemed to have managed neatly to sidestep the imperial demand to accept the *Ekthesis* by asserting that they did not have the authority to do this.¹⁷⁶ The archdeacon Sericus carried the correspondence between John IV and the emperors; he was subsequently appointed archdeacon: the head of the diaconate and a post of great authority. Pope Theodore nominated Sericus and Martin (then *apocrisarius*) as judges of Pyrrhus in the synod he demanded in Constantinople.¹⁷⁷ These members of the Roman clergy provided continuity within the church and must have been heavily involved in the devising of policy. The hardening of papal attitude from John IV to Theodore was not therefore simply a matter of the decisions of an individual pope. The difficulties faced by the Roman church in dealing with the theology of monoenergism and monothelitism spurred it to the election of Theodore, a decision to appoint a pope whose Palestinian background gave him special knowledge and experience. We

174 Pope Martin, *Letter to John of Philadelphia*. See pp. 394–5 below.

175 Noble (1984) 211–30; Richards (1979) 289–306.

176 Maximus, *Letter to Thalassius*, PG 129. 583–6. Severinus is not mentioned, but see the chronological reasoning in Sherwood (1952) 43.

177 Pope Theodore, *Letter to Patriarch Paul II*, PL 87. 78. For 'Sericus' see Booth (2013a) 292 n. 62.





may presume that Martin was chosen by the Roman church as Theodore's successor precisely in order to continue his opposition to imperial policy.

Motivations

Why did the Roman church take up the dyothelete position? Recent research has shown that dyotheletism was not a widespread movement across the empire, but rather that it was largely confined to the Palestinian monks and particularly to the followers of Maximus the Confessor.¹⁷⁸ How did a minority of dissidents manage to persuade the papacy to oppose the emperor and his patriarch in Constantinople?

The rapid and catastrophic disintegration of the empire in the face of the Arab invasions provided proof of the grievous error of monotheletism. The extraordinary fragmentation of the empire and failure of imperial authority required an explanation which could be most readily found in the idea of divine punishment. The empire's sin could be seen as arising from the failure of the emperor to fulfil his God-given duty to defend orthodoxy and to safeguard the purity of the faith, upon which the well-being of the empire depended. Moreover, if the emperor himself adopted and advocated heresy, this damaged the whole church and the empire.¹⁷⁹ But the right exercise of his responsibility for the faith would be rewarded with divine favour: Popes John IV and Martin appealed to the emperors to submit to papal demands by reminding them that victory and peace would be the divine reward for orthodoxy.¹⁸⁰ The issuing of the *Ekthesis* and *Typos*, viewed in Rome as heretical, had therefore called down God's anger and his punishment of the empire. The escalation of Arab conquests between 636 and 642, with the loss of Syria, Palestine and Egypt, gave urgency to the task of restoring orthodoxy.

The readiness of the papacy to identify monoenergism and monotheletism as the cause of the divine wrath arose from its traditional insistence on the supreme authority of the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon and of the Tome of Leo, which the same council had solemnly approved. From the time of Leo the papacy reacted to eastern attempts to mollify the miaphysites by modifying or playing down the authority of Chalcedon by insisting that nothing was to taken from, or added to, the

178 Brandes (2003) 117–18; Booth (2013a).

179 Grillmeier (1987) 141.

180 Pope John IV, *Letter to Constantine III and Heraclonas*, Schacht (1936) 245; Pope Martin, *Letter to the emperor Constans*, PL 87. 144.





Chalcedonian Definition.¹⁸¹ Moreover, a key text for the dyoenergists was contained within Leo's Tome itself: 'Each form [= nature] in communion with the other performs what is proper to it.'¹⁸² Despite monoenergist claims to the contrary, this text had clear dyoenergist implications.¹⁸³ Honorius' first letter to Sergius, as we have seen, condemned the statements both of one and of two operations as innovations. Likewise, the teaching of one will in Christ, however intended by its advocates, could be represented as a dangerous innovation and as a concession to miaphysitism, because of its apparent implication of one nature in Christ and consequent rejection of Chalcedon's doctrine of two natures. Loyalty to Chalcedon and Leo was a constant theme of all the popes of this period who opposed imperial policy.

At the same time, papal intervention was founded on ideas of papal primacy and of the Roman leadership of the universal church. The appeal to this by the Palestinian monks will have been an extraordinarily powerful one. In the 640s Maximus wrote praising the authority of the Church of Rome and its power of binding and loosing.¹⁸⁴ Stephen of Dora's submission to the Lateran synod spoke of Rome as a 'supreme and sovereign see' which presided over all others and which derived its authority from Christ's grant to Peter of the keys of heaven (p. 143 below). The letter of the primates of Byzacena, Numidia and Mauritania read out at the synod of 649 has a particularly fulsome statement of the need for ecclesiastical decrees throughout the world to be judged and ratified in Rome (p. 162). The responsibility for the faith in the church worldwide had a very strong resonance for the seventh-century papacy, which was at this time fostering and supporting missions in England and on the continent. After Gregory's initiation of mission to the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms his successors continued to further the evangelisation of the English and to develop the organisation of the English church, building close ties with Rome. Papal letters to the Anglo-Saxons cite the Gospel commandment to preach to all nations and the idea that the faith must be spread to the distant ends of the world.¹⁸⁵

181 Grillmeier (1987) 136–8.

182 Often cited in the Acts of 649, e.g. pp. 120–1 below.

183 Sergius attempted to deny this is a letter to Cyrus of Phasis (later of Alexandria) ACO² II/2, pp. 528,24–530,7.

184 See pp. 36–7 above.

185 Fritze (1969) 106–13, and see the letters of Pope Boniface V to Justus of Canterbury and King Edwin of Northumbria in Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. Colgrave and Mynors, II, 8 and 10, 158–61, 166–71.





The Roman championing of the anti-monothelete cause distorted and exaggerated the theological issues, and caused division in the empire at a time when there was need for unity.¹⁸⁶ But it can be understood in terms of the crisis of the empire, a perceived need to propitiate divine wrath, the Roman tradition of strict Chalcedonianism, and the papal ideology of a responsibility for the well-being of the entire church.

¹⁸⁶ See pp. 100–2 below.





III. THE ACTS, THEIR CHARACTER AND PURPOSE

The two versions

The Acts of the Lateran Synod exist in two versions, Latin and Greek, both contemporary to the council; as evidence of this we have letters of Pope Martin, written at the end of the council and accompanying the dispatch of copies of both versions (pp. 394–5 and 411 below). The two versions represent in the main the same redaction of the synodal proceedings, but a number of minor differences may be noted.

(1) At some unspecifiable late date the Greek tradition added a ‘hypothesis’ or summary at the beginning of each session, and also chapter numbers (within the sessions), which are anomalous in a set of conciliar acts and are omitted in our translation. Meanwhile, the Greek version omits or abbreviates the majority of the attendance and signatory lists.

(2) There are a few places where the Greek version lacks significant passages or details provided in the Latin. The *Ekthesis* has a long and laudatory heading only in the Latin version (p. 226 below); its omission in the Greek could well be due to suppression at a later date. In contrast, the fuller headings provided in the Latin for the extract from Cyrus of Alexandria’s *Plerophoria* and for Sergius of Constantinople’s letter in response to it, likewise read out at Session III,¹ could well be additions for the benefit of western readers who might need this additional information.

(3) There are two cases where a speech is attributed differently in the two versions. In Session I the opening address is attributed to the notary Theophylact in the Latin, but simply to ‘the holy council’ in the Greek. In Session II (p. 180) there is one speech that is attributed to Pope Martin in the Greek Acts, but to Maximus of Aquileia in the Latin version.

(4) The form of subscription to the ‘chapters’ or canons of the synod (p. 390) is different in the two versions, the Greek version being longer

¹ See pp. 212–13, nn. 76 and 83.





than the Latin, and making explicit mention of the *Ekthesis* and the *Typos*. Here the Latin version, which is what the bishops will have signed, is doubtless the original one.

(5) Finally, at the end of the two versions, while the Latin gives Pope Martin's letter to Amandus of Maastricht, the Greek appends eleven papal letters addressed mainly to eastern churches and churchmen. These letters were concerned to promote the work of the synod and to circulate its Acts. As such, they were natural appendices to the two versions.

These points of difference are few and unrelated. The one general conclusion to be drawn is that the Greek version preserved in extant manuscripts is a later edition of the text than the Latin. The same is true of the textual tradition of the acts of the early ecumenical councils, of which the Latin manuscripts are generally older and more reliable than the Greek. This tells us nothing about the relation between the *original* Greek edition and the Latin version of the Lateran Acts. Here it is the linguistic evidence that is decisive, and to this we now turn.

Which text is prior?

Since a council of Italian bishops will certainly have conducted its business in Latin, the natural presumption is that the Latin Acts are the original record of what was said or read during the synod, with the Greek Acts being a translation from the Latin, to serve a readership in the eastern provinces of the empire. However, already a century ago alert readers of the text noted anomalies that suggest that the extant Latin version is in fact a translation of the Greek. An article on the monothelites by W. Möller and G. Krüger that appeared in 1903 noted that the Latin version of the synod's Canon 10 was 'merely a helpless retroversion from the Greek translation of the Latin original'.² Likewise, in 1917 W.M. Peitz argued that the Latin version of the letters from the African churches read out at the second session was a translation from the Greek, and suggested that this was true of the Acts as a whole.³ All these scholars took it for granted that, since the synod must have conducted its business in Latin, the original Acts will have been in Latin, while the extant Latin version must be a later retroversion from the Greek, after the original text had been lost.

² Möller and Krüger (1903), 407.

³ Peitz (1917) 216, n. 1.





However, Erich Caspar, in a much cited article that appeared in 1932, put an end (for a time) to these suspicions of the Latin version.⁴ He argued convincingly that the extant Latin text of the African letters was the original, and suggested that the undeniably clumsy Latin of Canon 10 (and of the related doctrinal discussion in the acts of Session V) had arisen not from translation from the Greek but from the use by Latin writers and speakers of terminology derived from the Greek. Against the view that the original Latin version had been lost, he cited a passage in Milo's ninth-century Life of St Amandus which shows that Milo had in front of him the original copy of the Acts that had been sent to Amandus himself immediately after the synod.⁵ Now the extant Laon Codex of the Latin Acts was both contemporary to Milo and written in Amandus' monastery; it must be a copy of the manuscript to which Milo refers. It follows that the original text produced under Pope Martin was not lost but is identical to the version in the extant manuscripts. Caspar concluded that neither version was simply a translation of the other, but that they were produced together at the same time in a genuinely bilingual operation.

All this discussion was superseded, however, by a series of articles by Rudolf Riedinger (in preparation for his critical edition of the texts), which began to appear in 1976 and contained the first full comparison of the two versions. His conclusion was that the Greek version is the original and that the Latin version (save in the case of a few inserted documents)⁶ is a translation from the Greek. His principle arguments were two. Firstly, many of the biblical citations in the Latin version were taken neither from the Vulgate nor from a version of the pre-Vulgate Latin Bible (the *Vetus Latina*) but were *ad hoc* translations from the text of the Greek Acts.⁷ Secondly, a full and statistical comparison of the vocabulary of the Latin version of the Acts of 649 with the Latin version of the Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 680–681, made possible by the use of modern electronic resources, showed that the former exhibits a pattern of vocabulary preferences that is both distinctive (in comparison with the Acts of 680–1) and consistent throughout the whole text – save in the

4 Caspar (1932) esp. 76–92.

5 See p. 393 below.

6 The documents where the Latin version preserves the original Latin text are the letter from Maurus of Ravenna to Pope Martin (pp. 126–8 below) and the African documents read out at Session II (pp. 161–86). In addition, most (though not all) of the citations of Latin fathers in the florilegia read out at Session V give the original Latin wording.

7 See Riedinger (1976) 30; (1980) 51.





case of those inserted documents that had either been written in Latin or translated from Greek at an earlier date.⁸ The implication is that our Acts were composed in Greek and then translated into Latin by a single team of translators. This conclusion has been accepted in all subsequent scholarship.

Most strikingly, Riedinger's analysis applies not only to the documents and testimonia that the Acts contain but also to the speeches they ascribe to bishops during the synodal sessions.⁹ It follows that these too were composed in Greek and only subsequently translated into Latin. Since these bishops were Latin-speakers and would not have written in Greek, the momentous implication is that the speeches put into their mouths were not their own composition.

Who, then, compiled the Acts and composed the speeches? As Riedinger pointed out, they must be the Greek monks who were refugees from the Arab conquest of Syria-Palestine and had either settled in Rome permanently or came to Rome to support Pope Theodore's campaign against monothelism; their leader was Maximus the Confessor, the great champion of dyothelism. It is these Greek monks, well versed in the monothelite controversy (unlike the Italian bishops), who will have compiled the Acts and composed the speeches they contain.

The production of the Latin version

But who were the translators who produced the Latin version? Both Caspar and Riedinger asserted with confidence that these too must have been Greek monks, the same team as the writers of the Greek version.¹⁰ This was because of a presumption that at this date none of the Roman clergy or monks will have possessed the necessary linguistic and theological competence. Riedinger claimed that this was confirmed by the poor Latin of the translation, notably its fondness for the unclassical *quoniam* to mean 'that', and for periphrastic verbal constructions where a single Greek verb is rendered by an infinitive plus a common Latin verb normally in the indicative – to give one example, διδάσκει by *promulgasse dinoscitur* –

8 See the detailed analysis in Riedinger (1981). Riedinger (1996) provides supplementary tables, as well as a list (pp. 97–8) of the documents translated from the Greek which do not show the same vocabulary preferences (including the *Ekthesis* and the *Typos*) because they were not newly translated for the synod of 649.

9 See the lists in Riedinger (1981) 190–5.

10 Caspar (1932) 85–6. Riedinger (1985) 520–1; (1992) 154.





a usage that may suggest writers who preferred declining only the most familiar Latin words.¹¹ The argument is surprising, since both these usages (*quoniam* and verbal periphrasis) are common in much late antique Latin prose certainly penned by native Latin speakers.¹² The falsity of Riedinger's argument has been demonstrated conclusively by analysis of the letter from Pope Martin to Amandus with which the Latin Acts close. Riedinger discovered in this text precisely the same linguistic habits that had led him to attribute the Latin Acts as a whole to Greek writers.¹³ But more recent analysis of the letter has shown that, unlike the rest of the Latin Acts, it makes proper use of the *clausulae* distinctive of literary Latin and reveals a native and expert writer in the language.¹⁴

In addition, a positive argument for the involvement in the production of the Latin Acts of native Latin speakers from among the Roman clergy may be drawn from the biblical citations so common in the text. Take the *Encyclical Letter* with which the Acts close. This contains a veritable cento of biblical phrases and echoes; in the Latin version most of these follow the text of the Vulgate. That in each case Greek monks hunted out the right phrasing in Latin bibles is not credible; we must suppose that the translators were (or included) members of the Roman clergy who knew many verses or phrases of the Vulgate by heart.¹⁵ The picture of an anti-monothelite campaign in Rome which native Latin speakers could applaud but not assist begins to dissolve.

Further evidence may be found in the Latin citations read out in Session V. Even if these were taken (as we will show later) from a Greek collection,¹⁶ most probably from Sophronius of Jerusalem's collection of 600 dyoenergist testimonia, we have still to ask who assisted Sophronius (who had visited Rome and had Roman contacts) in hunting out suitable passages from the Latin fathers – and not only from obvious works like St Ambrose's *De fide* but also from the voluminous St Augustine, including passages from one of the later books of the *City of God* and from the *Contra*

11 Riedinger (1985), which includes a long list of examples. 'Promulgasse dinoscitur' occurs at ACO² I, p. 27, 12–13.

12 See Lewis and Short (1879) 1519, who give examples of this use of 'quoniam' from Tertullian and Cyprian. The periphrastic use of a common verb plus an infinitive is noted in Souter's far from complete glossary of late Latin (1949) in the cases of *debeo*, *dinoscor*, *habeo*, *possum*, *sustineo*, *videor*, all of which feature in Riedinger's list.

13 See Riedinger (1996).

14 See pp. 391–2 below, with its reference to Pollard (2009).

15 See pp. 389–90 for a fuller statement of this argument.

16 See p. 290 below.





Julianum opus imperfectum.¹⁷ The most ready answer is that there were well-educated Roman monks or clergy who had sufficient understanding of the monothelete debate to be of real help to their Greek allies. This must affect our judgement of the extent to which the native Italian episcopate was able to take an intelligent part in the Lateran Synod. For we must now address the most important and most difficult problem in the study of the Acts: if indeed, as Riedinger has proved, the original version was in Greek, what was the relation between the Acts, as a putative record of documents read out and speeches delivered, and what actually happened at the sessions, which must have been conducted in Latin?

The Acts and the Sessions

Riedinger's view was that the Acts were fully composed, in both their Greek and Latin versions, before the synod even met. And because the synod is likely to have been planned by Pope Theodore, he held that the date of composition must be pushed back into his pontificate, which ended (with his death) five months before the holding of the synod.¹⁸ The dates of the sessions, spread out through most of October 649, are in his view authentic, but at each session a notary read out the texts and all that the bishops had to do was to applaud and sign.¹⁹ The purpose of this curious procedure was to produce at the end of the day a presentation of the anti-monothelete case that would be simultaneously an authoritative pronouncement by pope and bishops and a sophisticated piece of theology, despite the theological illiteracy of the Italian episcopate. But could Popes Theodore and Martin really have been so guileful and yet at the same time so guileless as to imagine that such a farce would have been taken seriously by their opponents? Indeed, we would have to recognise an element of self-mockery in the 'minutes' of Session II, where these same Greek monks present themselves at the synod and with a straight face request that the Latin minutes be translated into Greek,²⁰ although (on Riedinger's hypothesis) the Greek text already existed in its final form. In all, the relation between text and reality in Riedinger's hypothesis lacks

17 See pp. 320–1 and 365–6 below. It is still debated whether Maximus during his long stay in Africa got to know Augustine's work. But there is not a single passage from Augustine in the florilegium in his *opusc.* 15 analysed below (pp. 288–9). See Daley (2008).

18 Riedinger (1977) 256; (1992) 149–50; (1998) 23.

19 Riedinger (1982a) 120.

20 See p. 154 below.





credibility. Can we do better, while respecting his irrefutable demonstration of the secondary character of the Latin version?

Pietro Conte, in his *Il Sinodo Lateranense dell' ottobre 649*, published in 1989 in response to Riedinger's edition of the Acts, noted the stress laid in them on the proper observance of the rules of synodical procedure: much is made in the Acts of the alleged breaking of the rules by the Constantinopolitan synods that had approved the *Ekthesis*, to which is contrasted (by implication) the admirable observance of these rules by the Lateran Synod itself.²¹ But how could the mode of procedure imagined by Riedinger have been seen as other than uncanonical? After noting that the bishops who are recorded in the Acts as making speeches during the sessions are few in number and must have been carefully selected (in fact they were simply those of metropolitan rank), Conte continues: 'These bishops with an active role could have been instructed in the theological topic in question through a preliminary reading of the Acts (already translated into Latin) and through direct contact with the bilingual Greek monks who had compiled and transcribed the text.'²² At the actual sessions, he suggests, the bishops read out the parts assigned to them – parts which were written by the Greek monks but seen and approved in advance by the bishops to whom speeches were assigned. This is more plausible than Riedinger's view of notaries reading out wholly fictitious speeches to silent bishops, but could even this count as proper synodal procedure, for it reduces the role of the bishops to that of actors reading out a script?

Certainly there will have been thorough preparation before each session, determinative of its essential sequence and outcome. The documents and the florilegia to be read had to be prepared beforehand, as at every council, and the chapters or canons with which the synod concluded could have been composed before the synod assembled. These together make up the essential matter of the meetings. Pope Martin and his assistants will have left nothing to chance. But this does not mean that every detail of the sessions was pre-planned. Indeed, a few details suggest small changes of plan during the course of the synod. For example, Theodore of Pharan was elevated to being the initiator of monoenergism only in the course of the Third Session (p. 203 below), while in the acts of Session I this role is attributed to Cyrus of Alexandria (p. 118).²³ Moreover, the proceedings of

21 Conte (1989) 130, citing Session IV, pp. 251–2 below.

22 Conte (1989) 142.

23 I owe this point to Jankowiak (2009) 248–9.





the synod display less total domination by its papal chairman than might have been expected. For example, at the beginning of the Fourth Session Pope Martin declares that it is time to turn to the statements of councils and fathers, but at this point Bishop Benedict of Ajaccio speaks up, requesting that, before this is done, there be added to the list of heretics to be censured the name of Patriarch Paul of Constantinople; a second speaker, whose name is not given, makes the request more specific, by asking for the reading of Paul's letter to the late Pope Theodore and also of the *Typos*, issued by Constans II at Paul's instigation. Pope Martin promptly approves the suggestion, and these two documents are then read out (pp. 252–4 below).²⁴ It would be naïve to suppose that these interventions were spontaneous – these bishops had doubtless been asked to relieve the pope of personal responsibility for the condemnation of Patriarch Paul and the *Typos* – but is it likely that they were wholly fictitious, or that even this small detail had been planned before the synod had opened?

A further point to be noted is the dates of the sessions – spread out over a whole month (from 5 to 31 October 649), with some substantial gaps. If the whole text had been composed in advance, this would have been a pointless imposition on bishops who will have been keen to return to their dioceses. This suggests that the conciliar proceedings had *not* been fully worked out in advance, and that each session was planned in sequence during the synod itself, in response to the course of preceding sessions.

At the same time the artificiality of the Acts as a record of synodal proceedings is undeniable. Their most suspicious feature is the amount of theological argumentation. The documents read out are regularly accompanied by lengthy commentaries, delivered by Pope Martin or one of the Italian metropolitans (Maximus of Aquileia and Deusdedit of Cagliari), often of remarkable theological sophistication. A notable example is Pope Martin's speech in Session V after the reading of the orthodox florilegia. He describes the fathers as professing two wills and two operations 'through number, terms, pronouns, identity, difference, quality, property, purport, and (in brief) every expression and proposition by which the true establishment of these tenets could be completely demonstrated', and proceeds to illustrate each of these grammatical or logical forms of demonstration one after the other (pp. 354–5). The point is not simply that this text, and the other comparable speeches in the Acts, are obviously

²⁴ Similar is Session III, pp. 203 and 216, where Sergius of Tempsa requests, and obtains, a reading first of Theodore of Pharan and then of a key text in Ps.-Dionysius.





literary compositions, but that bishops did not speak in this way at councils. The standard conciliar procedure, from Ephesus I through Constantinople III to Nicaea II, was for documentation of both orthodox and heretical views to be read out and then received by the assembled bishops with appropriate expressions of approval or disapproval, brief and dogmatic. Pope Martin and the Italian bishops would have been perfectly capable of the undemanding contribution that was expected of bishops on these occasions. They had no reason to read out (in the clumsy Latin translation provided) the speeches that the Acts place in their mouths. Why should we presume that these speeches were read out at the synodal sessions at all?

What was the purpose of the speeches? The Acts contain many documents and florilegia, but these were not likely to win over competent monotheletes by themselves: the florilegia in particular will not have seemed any more impressive than the dyoenergist dossier compiled by Sophronius of Jerusalem, which had been dismissed by Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople as wholly failing to prove its case.²⁵ Moreover, the synod could not claim the status of a true ecumenical council: Maximus the Confessor made this claim on its behalf, but the synod's own *Encyclical Letter* stops short of the same pretension, which would in any case have seemed absurd to eastern churchmen.²⁶ It was therefore decided to make the synodal acts a weighty document in another way, namely by the insertion into the written record of a series of speeches comparable to the polemical *opuscula* that Maximus issued in the 640s in his own name. These were not suitable as a script for the synodal sessions, but had their place in a text to be circulated subsequently. This was done for the benefit of sophisticated readers, partly in the West (whence the production of the Latin Acts) but primarily in the Greek East, where the argument against monotheletism had still to be won.

What of the stages in the compilation of the Acts? The selection and translation of the documents is likely to have preceded the opening of the synod. Each session will have been carefully prepared in advance. Draft acts may have been composed before each session for the use of the

25 So Sergius in his letter to Pope Honorius, ACO² II/2, p. 542, 14–19; Allen (2009) 188.

26 In *opusc.* 11 (PG 91. 137D), written in the aftermath of the synod, Maximus implies that it was the sixth ecumenical council, and in the *Disputation at Bizye* of 656 (Allen and Neil (2002) 88) he includes it among the 'holy and approved' councils, which means the same thing. In contrast, the *Encyclical Letter*, which urges other churches to 'conduct similar proceedings in harmony with us' (p. 403 below), attributes to the synod a prophetic rather than a magisterial role.





chairman (both in Greek and in a Latin translation), but, if so, these will have been revised after the session in question, in the light of its actual course; and it is at this final stage that we may place the insertion of the speeches.

In all, we have no reason to doubt that the synod of 649 was conducted in a perfectly normal fashion. The sessions will have been carefully planned in advance, but this did not exclude all elements of spontaneity. There is no reason to suppose that every detail was predetermined by a script that the bishops as actors had simply to read out. The combination of pre-planning and editing after the event is sufficient to account for all too smooth sequence of our text. The Acts remain a credible record of a council whose proceedings, choreographed in advance, were more akin to liturgy than to a modern parliamentary debate.





IV. THE LATERAN SYNOD

1. THE COURSE OF THE SYNOD

The synod took place in the basilica of the Lateran palace in Rome from 5 to 31 October and consisted of five sessions. The choice of the venue must have been deliberate and significant: the bishops were gathered together to discuss Christology in the pope's own episcopal basilica, dedicated to Christ the Saviour, adorned with an image of Christ himself.¹ The setting therefore endowed the synod with special solemnity.²

Attendance³

The synod was convened by Pope Martin in fulfilment of the plans of his predecessor Theodore; preparations must have started in the latter's pontificate. The synod, attended by 106 bishops, is perhaps the most substantial papal council of the early Middle Ages, not only because of its business – the condemnation of imperial policy and anathematisation of three patriarchs of Constantinople – but also in the weighty bilingual Acts it produced and in the number of bishops present.⁴ These hailed almost exclusively from Italy, the exceptions being two bishops from Palestine, John of Gabopolis and (from the second session) Stephen of Dora; Victorianus of Uzalis from Africa Proconsularis; and a bishop of 'Unnogoria', almost certainly the bishop of the Unnogours, nomads from the Pontic steppe, possibly then in Italy. The turn-out from imperial Italy was substantial, particularly from Ravenna, the Pentapolis, central and

1 Pietri (1976) I, 4–11; Brandenburg (2005) 23–6.

2 See Schneider (1951) for the possibly analogous case of the role of St Euphemia at Chalcedon.

3 The following section is indebted to Jankowiak (2009) ch. 2, 2.3, pp. 251–60. See also the Appendix and maps below.

4 The attendance lists are simply copied from the subscription list at the end of Session V.





southern Italy; a number of bishops also came from the islands of Sicily, Corsica and Sardinia. The north-east was less well represented, perhaps because of the Three Chapters Schism or because of the threat of Lombard attacks. Apart from the bishop of Aquileia, who played a prominent role in the proceedings, the bishops of Venetia and Istria were almost entirely absent.

The representation of the major churches of Ravenna and Aquileia was a matter of some importance for Pope Martin in his desire to project Italian unity. However, the archbishop of Ravenna sent deputies, excusing himself from attending in person.⁵ The attendance of bishops from Lombard-controlled territory is difficult to assess. The Lombard duchy of Spoletum was represented by the bishops of Spoletum, Assisium, Reate, the Marsi, Camerinum and Ortona; their presence was a sign of the positive relations between the popes and the duke of Spoletum.⁶ Bishops also attend from sees such as Clusium, Populonia, Volaterrae and Luca, which may have been under the control of the Lombard king.⁷ It is important to note that the confirmations of the synodal decrees by the bishops of Milan (in exile in Genoa) and Dortona were both added to the Acts when they were subsequently circulated; this suggests that the Lombard King Rothari may not have allowed his bishops to travel to Rome but was content for them to confirm the proceedings of this anti-imperial council. So the council presented a show of strength, emphasising the pope's spiritual authority over the politically fragmented territories of Italy. The experience of the Three Chapters Schism within the Italian church may well have underlined the need to obtain a united response to the religious policy of Constantinople.

However, this display of authority and unity may have been more apparent than real. There are pointers to dissent from the papal position in both Italy and Illyricum (which was also under papal jurisdiction). The two most important sees of Sicily, Catania and Syracuse, were not represented at the synod, which suggests opposition there. It is worth noting in this connection that a little earlier Maximus had to write to the 'holy fathers, hegumens, monks and orthodox peoples' of Sicily to defend his theological position against criticism he had received.⁸ This suggests a lively interest

⁵ See pp. 113 and 126–8 below.

⁶ Brufani (1992) 61–2.

⁷ For a maximal interpretation of Lombard royal control of Tuscany in the 640s, see Christie (1990). Others are more cautious: I am very grateful to Tom Brown and Ross Balzaretti for advice on this point. See also Bavant (1979) 41–88.

⁸ Maximus the Confessor, *Opusc.* 9, PG 91. 112–32.





in the monothelite controversy in the island and a critical stance towards Maximus' position. Sicily and southern Italy were all places of refuge for those fleeing the Arab invasions, and those in flight must have included partisans both of dyothelitism and of monothelitism.⁹

A letter of Pope Martin issued after the synod also records the dissent of the bishop of Thessalonica, Paul, who was the papal vicar in Illyricum.¹⁰ Paul had originally sent a synodical letter to Rome which was rejected as monothelite. Papal *apocrisarii* were sent to summon him to Rome to correct his fault, presumably by attending the synod. Paul, however, declined either to come to Rome or to condemn the monothelites. The sympathies of the bishops of Illyricum had long been closer to Constantinople than to Rome: at Chalcedon the Illyrian bishops had even been among those who interrupted the reading of Leo's Tome.¹¹ Paul even persuaded the Roman *apocrisarii* of the reasonableness of his decision; this suggests dissent from papal policy not only in Thessalonica but also within the Roman clergy.

How does the synod fit with Roman traditions of conciliar activity? In the sixth to eighth centuries Roman synods tended to take two forms. The first was that of relatively small assemblies, with bishops largely drawn from the immediate vicinity of Rome; bishops in attendance could number from a handful to twenty and over, and could include bishops visiting from other territories. For example, in October 679 various complaints by the Anglo-Saxon bishops, including the Northumbrian bishop, Wilfrid, were heard before a council of eighteen bishops including a visitor, Bishop Deodatus of Toul, and the Roman clergy.¹² However, on other occasions, when matters of major significance were under examination, Roman councils could bring together over a hundred bishops, with delegations from all Italy and further afield. Thus Pope Agatho's synod of Easter 680, convened as a preliminary to the 680/1 Council of Constantinople to set out the western position on monothelitism, consisted of 125 bishops, including three bishops from the Frankish kingdoms and also Bishop Wilfrid of York, who assumed the role of representing the church in England.¹³ In 731 Pope Gregory III called together a council of over seventy bishops 'from the

9 Sansterre (1983) I, 17–18.

10 For the letters written by Martin to Paul and to his clergy immediately after the synod see p. 396 below.

11 Price and Gaddis (2005) II, 4.

12 Levison (1912); Cubitt (2013) 328.

13 See ACO² II/1, 141–59 for the subscription list.





western parts' to condemn imperial iconoclasm.¹⁴ Martin's Lateran synod fits this type of enlarged council, largely made up of bishops from Italy but also drawing in a wider representation. In contrast to Pope Agatho's Easter council, which deliberately sought representatives from England and Francia, Martin's council was more restricted in its membership; but (as we shall see) it sought confirmation from the west subsequent to its meeting.

Preparations for the synod

The preparations for the council must have been considerable. Letters summoning the individual bishops must have been issued many months in advance. Stephen of Dora attended with a delegation of monks from the community of St Theodosius, near Jerusalem.¹⁵ These far-flung invitations must have been dispatched much earlier to allow time for preparation and travel. However, it is notable that the western churches outside Italy seem to have been contacted only in the aftermath of the synod.¹⁶

The preliminaries to the synod will have included not only the notice of its convocation but also the preparation of much of the documentation needed for its sessions. The notaries of the Roman church must have searched the papal archives for the decrees and letters cited in the proceedings. In the Acts it is Theophylact, the *primicerius* of the notaries, who is responsible for the production of documents from the archives.¹⁷ The *primicerius* was a very influential figure in the Roman church, and it likely that he played a prominent role in preparations for the synod.¹⁸ During the fifth session extensive florilegia of patristic excerpts were read out. Earlier collections by Sophronius and Maximus the Confessor formed the basis of these, and even in the case of the citations from the Latin Fathers the Greek version is primary; yet this does not exclude collaboration at various stages by educated Latin monks and clergy.¹⁹

14 *Liber pontificalis* 92. 192, trans. Davis (1992) 20–1 gives the number of assembled bishops as 93, but a letter of Pope Hadrian states 79, MGH, *Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, III, 15. See Noble (2009) 118–19.

15 Pope Martin, *Letter to George of St Theodosius*, PL 87. 168. See p. 395 below.

16 See pp. 78–9 below.

17 For the role of *primicerii* at ecumenical councils see Alexakis (1996) 15, 41–2.

18 Richards (1979) 290–2; Llewellyn (1971) 114–16.

19 See pp. 62–4 above.



**The synodal sessions²⁰**

The Acts of the Lateran Synod represent an edited and ‘improved’ account of the synod that records its unfolding stages and the documentation produced, but adds in the form of speeches sophisticated theological expositions to lend further force to the proceedings.²¹ While they reproduce the actual sequence of events, they are not a verbatim record of what was said. Since the synod cannot be reconstructed from any other source, the following narrative gives a summary of the proceedings as recorded in the Acts, while acknowledging that they were in many ways a literary construct.

The sessions follow a common conciliar pattern.²² The opening session presents the issues with which the synod was concerned, which are then examined in closer detail in the following session, where specific accusations are made. Subsequent sessions are devoted to the presentation of heretical extracts from the writings of those accused, followed by the reading out of orthodox patristic texts and statements of the faith. In the final session the heresies and their authors are condemned, and the synod closes with their anathematisation. The Lateran synod effectively resembles a trial, but the ‘heretics’ are tried in their absence and with no voices raised in their defence. So the synod unfolds with formal solemnity undisturbed by dissent.²³

The proceedings are dominated by the voice of Pope Martin, who opens three of the five sessions and closes two. In each session he comments at length on the submissions, often providing a theological commentary. His substantial interventions, commenting on the errors of monotheletism and declaring orthodox teaching, demonstrate the role of the papacy in teaching true doctrine and make manifest the universal responsibility of Rome to condemn heresy and defend the truth.

A handful of other bishops are represented as making significant contributions to the discussions.²⁴ The most prominent are the Italian metropolitans, Maximus, bishop of the great see of Aquileia (which had been reconciled to Rome over the Three Chapters Schism under Pope Honorius) and Deusdedit of Cagliari, who must have died shortly afterwards since his successor, Justin, added his name to those signatures recorded after

²⁰ For a fuller discussion see our introductions before the text of each session.

²¹ See pp. 66–7 above.

²² Alexakis (1996) 41, n. 182.

²³ Sieben (1979) 492–501.

²⁴ Ekonomou (2007) 131–2.





the council (p. 388 below). It is possible that Deusdedit did indeed make a significant contribution to discussion and that his frequent appearance in the Acts reflects his prominence, although not his actual words. Cagliari was the premier see of Sardinia and the island was a significant imperial territory. It played a not unimportant role in Mediterranean maritime networks, with close links to Africa. It must have received many refugees from the Arab conquests, including the community of monks settled at Cagliari to which Maximus' follower, Anastasius, wrote after 658 to request their help in lobbying Rome to refuse agreement with Constantinople over its doctrinal policy.²⁵ Cosentino has noted evidence of bilingualism there in the second half of the seventh century, and also perhaps earlier.²⁶ It is possible that Deusdedit was not only a senior figure in the church but also one with genuine knowledge of the doctrinal controversy.²⁷

The first session sets out the reason for the synod and the matters to be investigated. It is opened by the papal *primicerius*, Theophylact, whose affirmation of the preminent status of the see of Rome through its superior apostolicity establishes Martin's authority in convening the council (p. 116 below). The lengthy address attributed to Pope Martin (pp. 117–25) outlines the growth of the 'heresies', starting with Cyrus of Alexandria's *Plerophoria* (or *Pact of Union*), and proceeds to condemn three successive Patriarchs of Constantinople. Sergius and Paul are condemned for their authorship and promotion of the *Ekthesis* and *Typos*, respectively, and Pyrrhus for his confirmation of the *Ekthesis* and for his ultimate abjuration of dyotheletism after his repudiation of monotheletism in Rome. Although the imperial decrees, the *Ekthesis* and *Typos*, are condemned, Martin is careful to attribute their authorship to Sergius and Paul and to avoid explicitly censuring the emperors, Heraclius and Constans, who issued them. Martin's address also introduces some of the themes fundamental to the synod – that the imperial decrees and the teachings of monoenergism and monotheletism had outraged the Christian world and provoked many to petition and to complain to Rome.

A further matter of importance follows in this session – the reading out of a letter from Archbishop Maurus of Ravenna (brought by deputies)

25 Cosentino (2004) 329–45, 354–60; Allen and Neil (2002) 124–31. See also Jankowiak (2009) 337–40. See also Brandes (2003) 109–10 on the forced abjuration perhaps in 650s or 660s of the works of Maximus by the Sardinian bishop Euthalius of Sulci.

26 Cosentino (2004) 340–4, 357–8.

27 Less prominent bishops who speak in the Acts include Amabilis of Ostia, Benedict of Ajaccio, Leontius of Naples and Sergius of Tempsa (see our index of names).





explaining his inability to attend because of the threat of Lombard attack coupled with the absence of the exarch. Maurus' letter condemns the *Ekthesis* and set out a clear affirmation of his belief in two wills and operations. The see of Ravenna was second only to the see of Rome amongst the Italian dioceses, deriving its prestige from its place as the seat of imperial government. Its archbishops had enjoyed a long tradition of loyalty to the emperor.²⁸ Moreover, tension and rivalry between the two sees had existed for a long time, with Ravenna keen to obtain privileges from the emperor and independence from Rome.²⁹ It was, therefore, a matter of importance to demonstrate in the Acts Archbishop Maurus' support of the pope and the synod.

The themes established by Martin in the first session are continued in the second session, which sets out the specific appeals that had been received by Rome. However, the documentation read out and preserved in the Acts provides rather thin support for the idea of worldwide outrage. It consists of the letter of the papal vicar in Palestine, Stephen of Dora, the submission of the eastern monks then resident in Rome, a letter from Archbishop Sergius of Cyprus to Pope Theodore and a dossier of letters from African bishops dating to 646 (see pp. 132–3 below). The first two documents derive from the circle of Palestinian dyotheletes. The signatories to the letter of the eastern monks resident in Rome include abbots and representatives of the major Palestinian communities of St Sabas near Jerusalem and its offshoot of the same name in Africa, and possibly also of St Theodosius. The names Maximus and Anastasius are also found in the attestations (pp. 155–6), and are very probably to be identified with the Confessor and his disciple.³⁰ Boudignon has suggested that two other names amongst the signatories may be identified as members of Maximus' circle: Thalassius, the abbot of the community of the Renati in Rome may be the recipient of the Confessor's *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, and the presbyter Theocharistus is perhaps to be identified with a (former lay) correspondent of the Confessor.³¹ These identifications, if correct, would further bring out the dominance of Maximus and his followers over the proceedings.

28 Brown (1979) 6–12.

29 Ibid. 11–13; Deliyannis (2010) 283–4. In 666 the Emperor Constans, at Maurus' request, granted the see autocephaly, giving it some independence from Rome. Agnellus, *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Holder-Egger, cc. 110, 112 and n. 8, 350–1.

30 It is likely that one of the Theodores among the signatories is Theodore of Tarsus, resident in Rome at this date and later archbishop of Canterbury.

31 Boudignon (2004) 39–40. See, however, Sansterre (1983) I, 13.





The letter of Archbishop Sergius of Cyprus was a powerful document in Rome's arsenal: his predecessor Arcadius of Cyprus had been an important figure in the early development of the controversy and had hosted a synod in 636 which had rejected the position of Sophronius and Maximus.³² Sergius' letter is vehement in its support of Pope Theodore, calling for the anathematisation of those promoting the new teachings. However, it dated to 643 and thus predated the *Typos*. Furthermore, we know that at a later date Sergius abandoned the dyothelete position and joined the imperial camp.³³ In a similar fashion, the dossier of four letters from the African sees dated back to 646 and related to the needs of that time and not directly to the situation in 649.³⁴

However, the documents read out in the second session are remarkable for their affirmation of papal primacy and of the authority of the pope in the universal church.³⁵ In the letter of the eastern monks Martin is described as 'under Christ, the supreme head of the churches' (p. 153).³⁶ Archbishop Sergius of Cyprus' letter opens by affirming Pope Theodore's identity with Peter and states that 'upon your [Theodore's] foundation the pillars of the church are fixed You have been made destroyer of profane heresies, as the leader and teacher of the orthodox and unimpeachable faith' (p. 158). Finally, in Pope Martin's concluding discourse, he refers to the excommunication pronounced on Patriarch Paul by Pope Theodore, emphasising papal authority over Paul, by affirming that Peter alone was given the keys of heaven by Christ (p. 186). The second session, therefore, presents an image of the outraged looking to Rome to exercise its supreme responsibility and authority in protecting the faith.

Following the statement of complaints in the second session, the third and fourth sessions are devoted to an examination of the writings of the 'heretics'. Extracts from the writings of Theodore of Pharan and Themistius of Alexandria are produced and read out. The imperial decrees, the *Ekthesis* and the *Typos*, are also presented together with letters and other texts of the patriarchs Cyrus of Alexandria and Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul of Constantinople which demonstrated their endorsement and promotion of

32 Brock (1973) 316. See pp. 10–11 above.

33 The date of his defection is uncertain; see Neil (2006a) 167 with n. 31, and Jankowiak (2009) 288–9.

34 See pp. 138–9 below.

35 See p. 57 above for several examples. Cp. Conte (1971) 166–72, 372–4; Sieben (1979) 494–8.

36 On eastern attitudes to the papacy see Booth (2013a) 200–5; Larchet (1998c) 124–201.





the decrees. Then, in the fourth session, orthodox statements of faith from the ecumenical councils are received and read. The synod concluded in the fifth session with the full and final refutation of the heretics, carried out by the reading out of four orthodox florilegia of patristic excerpts designed to establish that dyoenergism and dyotheletism were not innovations but belonged to church tradition. Two collections of extracts by miaphysite and Nestorian heretics were then read out to show that monoenergism and monotheletism were their invention. The synod concluded with twenty ‘chapters’, or canons (pp. 376–83), setting out its dyoenergist and dyothelete position and anathematising the patriarchs Cyrus of Alexandria, and Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul of Constantinople, and the decrees the *Ekthesis* and the *Typos*.

The convocation and production of the Acts of the synod served a number of functions. By assembling so many bishops from Italy and the islands, Pope Martin achieved a show of unified opposition to imperial religious policy.³⁷ The synod provided the conciliar judicial forum in which the patriarchs could be prosecuted and condemned for heresy. Further, Maximus the Confessor’s polemical writings against monotheletism had repeatedly stressed that correct teaching is provided and safeguarded by scripture, the teachings of the Fathers and conciliar tradition: the convocation of the Lateran synod itself embodied the authority of the councils, and its inclusion of a substantial dyothelete florilegium emphasised the importance of the Fathers as the expounders of tradition.³⁸ Finally, the synodal Acts set forth a resounding statement of papal primacy and of the pope’s authority as the prime guardian of orthodoxy in the universal church.

2. THE AFTERMATH

When the convocation of the Lateran synod finally closed with its solemn anathematisation of the condemned dogmas and patriarchs, the work of the final preparation and completion of the proceedings of the council commenced. The production of the Acts in Greek with a Latin translation signalled the intention of Pope Martin to disseminate them to the churches in both East and West. A number of letters were drafted in connection with

³⁷ The *Liber pontificalis* 76. 132, trans. Davis (2000) 72, claimed that when the exarch Olympius arrived in Rome soon after the synod he found ‘all the Italian bishops, *sacerdotes* and clergy’ united against the *Typos*.

³⁸ Larchet (1998c) 188–9.





this purpose. Amongst these was Pope Martin's encyclical, issued in the name of the pope and all the bishops of the synod (pp. 398–408 below).³⁹ It reprised the decrees of the synod, and appealed to the community of the orthodox throughout Christendom to join in its condemnation of heresy and affirmation of the true faith. It specifically requested that synods should be held locally for this purpose. Pope Martin's letter to the emperor Constans (written in Greek, like the encyclical) was likewise signed by the bishops of the synod (pp. 412–17). It addresses the emperor in respectful terms, but describes him and his grandfather, Heraclius, as deceived and misled by their patriarchs. It asks the emperor to confirm the synodal decrees, assuring him that, if he does, his orthodox faith will be rewarded by God with victory over the barbarians.

A number of other Greek letters of Martin's survive, likewise appended to the Greek Acts, which further illustrate his actions in publicising the proceedings of the Lateran Synod.⁴⁰ A number of these letters were directed to churchmen in Palestine and Transjordan. Martin wrote to Bishop John of Philadelphia appointing him papal vicar to replace Stephen of Dora, giving him authority in the patriarchates of Jerusalem and Antioch to consecrate bishops and clergy in place of those loyal to the *Typos*. He sent him the encyclical and proceedings of the Lateran synod which he asked him to publicise. Further letters in this collection, to clergy and monks in Syria and Palestine, admonish them to support John in his work. These letters demonstrate the fact that those bishops and priests who had accepted the *Typos* were regarded as heretics who should no longer officiate in the church; this included the patriarchs of Antioch and of Alexandria. His interventions, together with similar steps taken by his predecessor Theodore, represented an unprecedented assumption of authority in the territory of the eastern patriarchates.

This collection of Greek letters includes two directed to churches directly under papal jurisdiction. Martin sent the synodal Acts and accompanying encyclical to the church of Carthage and issued two letters to Thessalonica, one to Archbishop Paul deposing him for failing to support the synod and the second to the church of Thessalonica informing it of Paul's deposition.

The account in the *Liber pontificalis* of the Lateran synod describes how Martin had copies of the synodal proceedings made and 'sent them

39 For the drafting of the encyclical see pp. 389–91 below.

40 For a list and summary of these letters see pp. 394–6 below. See, too, the important analysis in Jankowiak (2009) 265–77.





through all the districts of East and West, broadcasting them by the hands of the orthodox faithful'.⁴¹ Martin did in fact send copies of the Acts to the western churches, to the Frankish kingdoms and possibly also to Visigothic Spain. Preserved in the Latin Acts of the synod is a letter from Pope Martin to the Frankish bishop Amandus (pp. 408–12 below). Amandus was a missionary monk with a marked devotion to Rome. He had received his evangelical vocation on his first visit to Rome from a vision of St Peter and had subsequently preached in Gaul; by 629 he had been pressed by the king, Chlothar II, into consecration as a missionary bishop. After a second pilgrimage to the apostolic city he had carried out missionary work in north-east Francia, in the Scheldt region, across the Danube among the Slavs and also among the Gascons. He eventually returned to Francia and was made bishop of Maastricht.⁴² It is likely that it was in this capacity that he had written to Pope Martin, seeking to resign his see because of irregularities among his clergy and also requesting relics and copies of some books. In reply, Martin took the opportunity to send him the Lateran Acts and the encyclical. The pope explained the emergence of the heresy up to the issuing of the *Typos*. Although he states that Amandus is aware of the heretical activities of Patriarch Sergius and the emperor Heraclius, it is clear that Francia had been untouched by these troubles. Martin goes on to request that Amandus convene a synod locally to affirm the decisions of the Lateran synod. He further asks him to approach King Sigibert III of Austrasia to send a delegation of bishops to Rome who will also then take the Acts and synodal letters to the Emperor Constans.

There is no doubt that the letter reached Amandus: in the ninth century Milo, a later biographer of the saint, used it and described its original papyrus form, and it is transmitted with a copy of the Latin Acts in a manuscript from Amandus' own foundation at Elnon, near Antwerp.⁴³ What action he or King Sigibert took is unknown. However, evidence of similar approaches by Martin to the neighbouring Frankish kingdom of Neustria can also be traced. The Life of St Eligius, a seventh-century hagiography reworked in the eighth century, includes a lengthy description of the monothelete heresy and Martin's exile and death.⁴⁴ It describes the appearance of the heresy, its imperial backing and the necessity for

41 *Liber pontificalis* 76. 131, trans. Davis (2000) 71.

42 Anon, *Vita Amandi episcopi*, MGH, Scr. Rer. Merov. 5, 4–13, 16, 18, 21, 434–46; Wood (1994) 312–13 and (2001) 39–42.

43 Milo, *Vita Amandi episcopi*, MGH, SRM 5, 452, ACO² I, xiii.

44 *Vita Eligii*, MGH, SRM 4, 689–91.





the convocation of the Lateran Synod. Its account of Martin's death is a ringing defence of his status as a martyr. It reports that he published a statement of faith and appended to it a letter which was sent to the regions of Gaul, asking the king of Neustria to send suitable delegates to Rome to assist in his suppression of the heresy. Eligius and a companion, probably Bishop Audouen of Rouen, were chosen but prevented by an unexplained event from going. It has been argued that their place was taken instead by Wandregisl, abbot of St Wandrille.⁴⁵

Although the description of the Lateran synod and of Martin's death is a later interpolation, there is no reason to doubt the appeal to the king of Neustria.⁴⁶ Eligius and his associate Audouen were linked to Amandus by a network of monks and monastic patrons connected to the Irish saint Columbanus and his monastery at Luxeuil, and by their association with the court of King Dagobert, where Amandus was said to have been persuaded by Eligius and Audouen to baptise the king's son.⁴⁷ Eligius and Amandus shared a zeal for missionary work, and both were active in north-east Francia, in the region around the Scheldt. It was in these circles that ideas of universal mission took root.⁴⁸ Columbanus (d. 615), missionary and monastic founder, protested to Boniface IV against papal condemnation of the Three Chapters, invoking papal primacy in his appeal to the pope to take action; and his monastic circle showed a continuing anxiety over the Three Chapters controversy.⁴⁹ The involvement of these men in the monothelete controversy brings together a number of strands – the difficulties caused by the Three Chapters Schism, papal engagement in the idea of universal mission, and the importance of Rome as a centre of cult and pilgrimage, evidenced by Amandus' two pilgrimages there.⁵⁰

Pope Martin not only disseminated the proceedings of the Lateran synod to his contacts but also celebrated it by the decoration of the church of Santa Maria Antiqua, putting up frescoes with texts from the synod.⁵¹ The church was situated in the Forum at the foot of the Palatine and had

45 Ibid. See Borias (1987) 58–63; Wood (2007) 239–40.

46 See Westeel (1999); Wood (2014).

47 Anon, *Vita Amandi episcopi*, 440–1; Wood (1994) 187–8, 191–2; Fritze (1969).

48 See p. 57 above.

49 Bracken (2002); Wood (1994) 196.

50 Ian Wood (2014) has also surmised that visit of Bishop Taius of Toledo to Rome in the years 651–3 (*Anonymous Chronicle to 754*, 341–3) should be connected to Pope Martin's lobbying of the west over monotheletism.

51 Rushforth (1902) 68–72; Nordhagen (1962 and 1979).





formerly been part of the imperial palace. While the details are obscure, the church seems to have been closely linked to the Byzantine administration and military elite in Rome.⁵² The surviving fragments from the church show that Martin had painted upon the two arms of the apsidal arch depictions of four of the church fathers – Leo the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil of Caesarea and John Chrysostom, all holding scrolls containing Greek extracts from their writings taken from the florilegia read out at the fifth session.⁵³ Rubery has argued that these were intended as concise statements of the dyothelete theological position and probably reflected the input of Maximus.⁵⁴ Martin's decoration of this church represented a further promotion of the synod, and one in the heart of imperial Rome in an area frequented by imperial officials and pilgrims.⁵⁵

The fate of Pope Martin

The Roman Church had since 647/8 presented three grave provocations to imperial authority – in refusing to accept the conciliatory stance of the *Typos*, in the consecration of Pope Martin without imperial confirmation and finally in the convocation of the Lateran synod. However, the emperor's ability to respond quickly and effectively to these provocations was hampered by the deepening military crisis in the east.

Constans had in 649 despatched a new exarch, Olympius, to fill the vacancy at Ravenna. He was sent out with orders to impose the *Typos* on Italy and to arrest Martin as a usurper to the pontifical throne, but to proceed cautiously to avoid military unrest. According to the *Liber pontificalis*, whose account is designed to absolve Martin from any treasonable activities, when he arrived he found the Roman and Italian churches united against the *Typos*, presumably a reference to the Lateran Synod.⁵⁶

52 Coates-Stephens (2006) 155–8.

53 The four passages are p. 333, §3, p. 314, §1–2, and p. 342, §29 below.

54 Rubery (2011).

55 This suggestion is attractive, but there are problems. Apart from the obvious fact that the textual link between these frescoes and the Lateran Acts would have been perceived by very few, of the four passages selected two are explicitly dyoenergist (and include the familiar sentence from Leo's Tome), but the other two (which state the oneness of will between Father and Son) are at best irrelevant and at worst suggestive of monotheletism. A more likely context for these frescoes is 663, when Pope Vitalian was pursuing a policy of compromise and Constans II visited Rome. [RP]

56 *Liber pontificalis* 76. 131, trans. Davis (2000) 72. Jankowiak (2009) 244 interprets this to mean that he arrived during the synod.





He decided to assassinate Martin, but, when foiled by divine intervention, proceeded to make peace with the pope, broke with the emperor, and took the army and left Italy for Sicily.⁵⁷ However, it seems very likely that Martin in some measure was complicit in Olympius' revolt.⁵⁸

In 653 Constans was able to send out a new exarch, Theodore Calliopas, again with orders to arrest and depose Martin. Theodore arrived in June and swiftly seized Martin, transporting him by boat to Constantinople, where the pope arrived after a three-month journey on 17 September 653.⁵⁹ After a further ninety-three days in prison he was brought to the imperial palace, where he was tried before the Senate. The sources for his trial and exile are embedded in the *Narrations concerning the Exile of the Holy Pope Martin*, which includes four letters from the pope himself and an independent, apparently eye-witness, account of his trial (the *Commemoration*).⁶⁰ The responsibility for this collection of texts describing Martin's exile and sufferings lies with a Palestinian dyothelete monk, Theodore Spudaeus, who also composed a further account of the sufferings of other dyothelete exiles including Maximus (the *Hypomnesticum*).⁶¹ The dossier has a clear hagiographical purpose and portrays Martin as Christlike in his sufferings.

According to these texts, the charges raised against Martin were almost exclusively concerned with his treacherous actions. In a letter written after his arrest Martin denied allegations that he had sent communications and funds to the Muslims and also distanced himself from Olympius. He also indignantly repudiated the charge that he had blasphemed against the Virgin.⁶² However, no reference was made in his trial at Constantinople

57 On Olympius' revolt see Jankowiak (2009) 278–9 against Stratos (1976).

58 Rubery (2012).

59 On this journey see McCormick (2001) 483–8, 503–4.

60 The text survives in the Latin translation of Anastasius Bibliothecarius. For comment see Conte (1991) 221–4; Chiesa (1992); Brandes (1998) 153 n. 77; and Neil (2006a) 95–103, dating it to c.655–62. Its account is more extensive than that of the *Greek Life of Martin*, which appears to epitomise the same Greek original (and in places preserves a preferable reading to the Latin). For the relation of the two texts see Brandes (1998) 154–5; Neil (2006a) 94, 110–15. On the independent *Commemoration* see Chiesa (1992) 212–22; Neil (2006a) 96–9, 126–8.

61 The *Hypomnesticum* survives both in Greek and in Anastasius Bibliothecarius' Latin. For discussion of the text, which dates to c.669, see Conte (1991) 224–8; Brandes (1998) 156–8. On the Palestinian origin of its author, Theodore Spudaeus, see Noret (1999); Booth (2013a) 302 n. 111, against Neil (2006a) 129.

62 See the pope's first two letters at *Narrations concerning the Exile of the Holy Pope Martin* 3–7; cp. the account of the *Commemoration* at *Narrations* 12–13 and *Greek Life of Martin* 3–6.





to the record to the Lateran Synod or to his activities with regard to the faith. Indeed, when he tried to raise the *Typos* he was immediately silenced. The accusations concentrated on his complicity in the revolt of the exarch. Martin's only defence against this charge appears to have been his powerlessness with regard to the revolt.⁶³

Martin was regarded in Constantinople as a usurper who had unlawfully taken the papal throne and as a traitor.⁶⁴ He was sentenced to death but this was commuted to exile in the Cherson, where he died after two years.⁶⁵ His hagiographic dossier claims that he was brutally treated from the time of his arrest to his exile and death. In exile, his letters present a pitiful picture of a man in need of food and supplies, and lament the failure of his supporters, including the Church of Rome, to send assistance.⁶⁶ After his death – on either 16 September 655 or 13 April 656 – his tomb at the church of St Mary Blachernes in the Cherson was regarded among the dyotheletes as a shrine, and Theodore Spudaeus, with his brother Theodosius of Gangra, collected relics of his.⁶⁷ His biography in the *Liber pontificalis* recorded that the pope 'works many miracles even to the present day' but described him not as a martyr but as a confessor.⁶⁸

The fate of Maximus the Confessor

No less tragic was the fate of Maximus the Confessor. The sources suggest that he was arrested in Rome along with Martin, in June 653.⁶⁹ If so, however, he must have been held captive elsewhere for quite some time, for he did not arrive in Constantinople until some point in 655, and at once faced trial for sedition before the senate.⁷⁰ Our understanding of this dramatic event is dependent upon a text entitled *Relatio motionis*

63 See esp. *Narrations* 16–17, and cp. *Greek Life of Martin* 7, with Booth (2013a) 301–5.

64 See *Narrations* 7, also George of Resh'aina, *Life of Maximus* 21, with Brandes (1989) 164–7.

65 *Narrations* 23; Brandes (1989) 173–5.

66 See the papal letter embedded in *Narrations* 29–30. For the letters see the discussion of Cremascoli (1992) 250–3; Neil (2010).

67 For the different dates of Martin's death see *Greek Life of Pope Martin* (Peeters 261) (= April); contra Theodore Spudaeus, *Narrations* 28, *Hypomnesticum* (Greek) 8 and *Hypomnesticum* (Latin) 5 (= September). For discussion see Neil (2006a) 117–20.

68 *Liber pontificalis* 76. 133, trans. Davis (2000) 72.

69 For Maximus' arrest in Rome see *Greek Life of Maximus Confessor (Third Recension)* 23, and Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6121; Jankowiak (2009) 347–50; Booth (2013a) 324–5.

70 For the date of Maximus' trial – which cannot be offered with more precision – see





or *Record of the Trial*, which Maximus or a close disciple penned soon after the event itself.⁷¹ We cannot, of course, read the *Record* as its name implies: it is above all a propagandistic piece, composed to defend and to celebrate Maximus' position. As such, however, we can perhaps assume that the text attempts to rebut something of the actual charges levelled at Maximus and his co-defendant, Anastasius the Disciple. As we saw above, the trial literature of Martin suggests that the pope's accusers had ignored his role within the Lateran Council, and instead focused on his possible acquiescence in the exarch's rebellion.⁷² But in the *Record*, at least, there is no such pretence, and the charges reflect the genuine implication of political and religious ideologies which we have encountered within Maximus' own output. Thus he is therein accused of advising the general of Numidia against the defence of Egypt, 'since God did not deign that the empire of the Romans be assisted under the reign of Heraclius and his kin';⁷³ of reporting to the rebellious exarch Gregory (via Pope Theodore) a dream which predicted his imminent triumph over Constans;⁷⁴ and of disparaging the emperor in Rome (an accusation which prompts Maximus to offer his famous challenge to the imperial right to debate or define dogma).⁷⁵ Although the *Record* is careful to avoid direct condemnation of the emperor, ascribing (as it does) the anathematised *Typos* to malevolent advisors, it nevertheless offers a fundamental challenge to the religious aspirations of the imperial office.⁷⁶

Maximus and Anastasius were condemned and exiled to separate locations in Thrace.⁷⁷ The emperor Constans, however, (according to a further propagandistic text which Maximus' circle composed in the same

Allen and Neil (2002) 35. For his trial upon arrival in the capital see *Record of the Trial* 1; and for the location and attendees in detail Brandes (1998) 180–3.

⁷¹ For the date – after the trial in 655 but before Maximus' transference from Bizye to Perberis in September 656 – see *Record of the Trial* 13. The *Greek Life of Maximus (Second Recension)* attributes the *Record* to 'the fine disciple of the holy man' (PG 90. 88D), perhaps indicating Anastasius the Disciple. For a discussion of the text and its authorship see Conte (1991) 207–12; Brandes (1998) 155 n. 90; Winkelmann (2001) 140 no. 132.

⁷² Theodore Spudaeus, *Narrations* 17 (Neil 196). Cp. *Greek Life of Pope Martin* 7.

⁷³ *Record of the Trial* 1 (Allen and Neil 48–50). On these charges see also Brandes (1998) 183–5. On the general of Numidia, Peter (later exarch of North Africa), see p. 38 above.

⁷⁴ *Record of the Trial* 2, with the wonderful exegesis of Brandes (1998) 185–92, followed in Booth (2013a) 308–9.

⁷⁵ *Record of the Trial* 4, with Booth (2013a) 310–13.

⁷⁶ On the emperor and the *Typos* see the various statements at *Record of the Trial* 7, 9, 11.

⁷⁷ See *Record of the Trial* 13, with Jankowiak (2009) 318 for the suggestion that an original sentence of death was (as with Martin) commuted to exile.





period) continued to attempt to secure his submission, and soon after his trial dispatched the Constantinopolitan consuls and a high-profile bishop, Theodosius, once again to debate with him (in August 656).⁷⁸ Within the text which purports to record that meeting and its aftermath (the so-called *Disputation at Bizye*) we encounter several familiar themes: Maximus' refusal of the 'one' operation and will; his opponents' defence of 'what occurred for the sake of accommodation (*oikonomia*)'; and Maximus' restatement that doctrinal silence is equivalent to annulment.⁷⁹ However, we also discover evident anxieties over the status of the Lateran Council, for when one of Maximus' interlocutors states the council was not ratified, 'since it occurred without the order of the emperor', Maximus states that it is orthodox doctrine which gives a council status, not imperial approval.⁸⁰ In the face of this intransigence, Constans' emissaries are, however, represented as making some remarkable concessions, including an offer to annul the *Typos* and the qualified recognition of 'two' operations and wills.⁸¹ But when in September Maximus was brought to Rhegium – in evident expectation of an imminent accord with the emperor, and with the promise of considerable honours – he is there said once again to have refused Constantinopolitan attempts to secure his recognition of the *Typos*, and thereby to have brought on his second period of exile, to Perberis in Thrace.⁸²

That Constans did not execute Maximus is perhaps indicative of the latter's status as the central figurehead of the anti-monothelete resistance, and of the subsequent affirmation which his submission would have offered the Constantinopolitan position.⁸³ At the same time, however, the emperor might have feared the potential political fallout from more aggressive action in a period in which Martin's successor Eugenius remained wedded

78 The text is the *Disputation at Bizye*, which places the meeting on 24 August 656. For the date of the text see *Disputation at Bizye* 2 and 9, speaking of 'the recently passed fourteenth indiction' (Allen and Neil (2009) 76) and 'the current fifteenth indiction' (Allen and Neil (2009) 106) – that is, 656/7. For discussion of text and authorship see Conte (1991) 212–17; Brandes (1998) 156, 205; Winkelmann (2001) 148–9 no. 145.

79 See esp. *Disputation at Bizye* 3, and for *oikonomia* *ibid.* 12, with Ohme (2008a) 322–4.

80 *Disputation at Bizye* 4 (Allen and Neil 88).

81 *Ibid.* 4–5, with Theodosius' anxieties that 'two' presents Christ as warring against himself, and the statement that Sergius and Pyrrhus had used 'one' in respect of the union.

82 *Ibid.* 12. It is possible that Maximus here became associated with a further political rebellion, that of Constans' brother Theodosius; see Jankowiak (2009) 341–7, followed in Booth (2013a) 317–19.

83 *Disputation at Bizye* 10.





to Maximus' cause and the Muslims continued to encroach upon Roman territories.⁸⁴ Soon, however, these twin pillars were to collapse and thus, perhaps, was Maximus' fate sealed. From 656 the attention of the Muslims was redirected to the first Arab civil war, and in 657 Eugenius' successor Vitalian re-established communion with Constantinople on the basis of the simultaneous recognition of 'one and two' wills.⁸⁵ Maximus was now a deflated and isolated figure; and in 662 – having been brought to the capital, where he continued to agitate the new consensus – he was condemned at a general council.⁸⁶ According to a text attached to the *Disputation at Bizye* (the 'Third Sentence'), Maximus then had his tongue removed and his right arm removed, the impious instruments through which he had sown dissent. He was then sent into permanent exile in Lazica⁸⁷ and died soon after, on 13 August.⁸⁸ Therewith died the period's most prominent and persistent religious dissident, fallen some distance from the dramatic heights of power which he had attained at the time of the Lateran Synod.

84 For the pressure from the clergy and people of Rome that forced Eugenius to anathematise the *Typos* see *Liber pontificalis* 77, trans. Davis (2000) 73.

85 See *ibid.* 78, with the response of Patriarch Peter of Constantinople mentioned in ACO² II/1, 109, 111; also Maximus, *To Anastasius the Disciple* and Anastasius, *To the Monks of Cagliari*, both dating to 658.

86 For Maximus' removal to the capital, and his continued agitation, see George of Resh'aina, *Life of Maximus* 25–6; Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* 11.9; *Anonymous Chronicle to 1234*, 130; with Jankowiak (2009) 347–50 and Booth (2013a) 324–5. For the council see *Disputation at Bizye* 16–17, which must be identical with that described in ACO² II/1, 228–30.

87 For this 'Third Sentence' see *Disputation at Bizye* 17, with Brandes (1998) 156; Winkermann (2001) 151–2 no. 149. For the punishment see also Theodore Spudaeus, *Hypomnesticum* (Greek) 4, *Hypomnesticum* (Latin) 2; Anastasius Apocrisiarius, *Letter to Theodosius of Gangra* 1, in Allen and Neil (2002) 132; Theophanes, *Chronicle* AM 6160; Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle* 11.9; *Anonymous Chronicle to 1234*, 130 – with some doubts as to its realisation in Booth (2013a) 323 n. 202.

88 See Anastasius Apocrisiarius, *Letter to Theodosius of Gangra* 4, and Theodore Spudaeus, *Hypomnesticum* (Greek) 9.





V. THE THEOLOGICAL ISSUES

Monoenergism

The Greek word *energeia*, for which the Latin is *operatio* and the most common English renderings are ‘energy’ and ‘operation’, refers to the activity and movement of a particular nature or individual and the changes it either effects or experiences. Each essence or nature that exists and can be known to be distinct must have its own distinctive operation. As the acts of 649 quote Cyril of Alexandria, ‘No sensible person would concede that things different in kind and nature possess the same operation.’¹ The constantly reiterated argument of the dyoenergists of the seventh century was that the Chalcedonian doctrine of two natures in Christ, divine and human, implies two corresponding ‘natural’ operations.

Nevertheless, even prior to the seventh-century controversy there had been prominent writers, either Chalcedonian or pre-Chalcedonian but approved at Chalcedon, who preferred to speak of ‘one operation’ in Christ; these include Cyril of Alexandria, Patriarch Menas of Constantinople (d. 552), Pope Vigilius (d. 555), and Patriarch Anastasius of Antioch (d. 598).² Writing to Pope Honorius, Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople described these statements as isolated utterances that made no attempt to elevate monoenergism into authoritative church teaching.³ But what is really significant is that monoenergism developed *within* Chalcedonian

1 Cited below on p. 312, §28 and p. 345.

2 Cyril, *In Ioh.* IV.2, PG 73. 577CD. For Menas’ Address see Winkelmann (2001) 45–6. Vigilius’ affidavits are in Price (2009) II, 80. For Anastasius’ monoenergism see Maximus the Confessor, *opusc.* 20 (PG 91. 228–45, esp. 229B–233B). Sergius’ claim that, in contrast, none of the ‘approved fathers’ spoke of ‘two operations’ (ACO² II/2, p. 544, 14–16) was an exaggeration, but the explicit formula was rare (p. 343, §33 is exceptional) and had less patristic support than ‘one operation’.

3 ACO² II/2, p. 544, 11–14. This part of Sergius’ letter repeats the *Psephos*, issued by a home synod at Constantinople. For the importance of the distinction between dogma and mere theologoumena in this context see Ohme (2008a) 314–15, and for an important analysis and application by an orthodox theologian Bolotov (1898).





Christology.⁴ It is therefore a mistake to treat monoenergist expressions as miaphysite in origin and their adoption as a mere compromise with the opponents of Chalcedon.⁵

The seventh-century debate was initiated in the 610s and carried through into the 630s by the same Sergius of Constantinople, who wrote round to various bishops and theologians tentatively encouraging the ascription to Christ of a single operation.⁶ This ‘monoenergism’ was then given a place by Cyrus of Alexandria in his *Plerophoria* or *Pact of Union* of 633, a doctrinal declaration intended to make Chalcedonian Christology acceptable to the miaphysites of Alexandria. The relevant section of the document is cited, and pilloried, in the Lateran Acts (p. 212). But despite malicious claims to the contrary advanced by dyoenergist opponents,⁷ the doctrine did not deny Christ human operations (of eating, sleeping, emotions and the rest) but insisted on taking them together with his divine operations as constituting the unified ‘theandric’ (divine–human) operation of the God–man, according to a much-cited formula in Dionysius the Areopagite.⁸

Modern interpreters have sometimes attempted to explain monoenergism in terms of a transfer of operation in Christ from his two natures to his single hypostasis or personhood. But since the natures are inconceivable without their corresponding operations, the language of ‘transfer’ is unhelpful. Rather, just as the one ‘composite’ hypostasis (ὁπόστασις σύνθετος) was formed by a conjunction of the two natures, so the one operation arose from a composition (or synthesis) of their operations. This doctrine had its origins in the rejection of any notion of two separate and independent operations in Christ. Pope Leo had famously declared in his Tome that ‘each form in communion with the other operates what is proper to it’; note the phrase ‘in communion with the other’, which was wilfully

4 The by now classic exposition of this is Uthemann (1997).

5 Note also that Cyril’s Commentary on John, which contains a monoenergist statement (n. 3 above), predates the Nestorian Controversy; it was only during the latter that he began to use the ‘one nature’ formula, initially in *Contra Nestorium* II (PG 76. 60D), and then in a number of letters interpreting the Formula of Reunion of 433. Cyril’s monoenergism was not a consequent of miaphysitism.

6 Sergius to Theodore of Pharan: see Maximus, *Disputation with Pyrrhus*, PG 91. 332BC. Sergius to Cyrus of Lazica (later of Alexandria), ACO² II/2, 528–30. Sergius to George Arsas: see Winkelmann (2001) 52–3.

7 As by Ps.-Irenaeus, *Treatise on the Faith to Deacon Demetrius*, in Richard (1966) esp. 436–8.

8 Ps.-Dionysius, *ep.* 4, as cited in Session III, p. 217 below.





overlooked by those who accused Leo of the Nestorian error of splitting Christ into two. As Leo stated in a later text (echoing a statement by Hilary of Poitiers a century before), the flesh does not act without the Word, nor the Word without the flesh.⁹ This became a standard assertion, being repeated, for example, by Maximus the Confessor ('He did not do divine things divinely, since he was not only God; nor did he do human things in a fleshly way, since he was not a mere man')¹⁰ and also by Pope Martin in the Lateran Acts: 'He did not perform what is divine with his Godhead alone nor what is human with his bare manhood, but through the flesh ... he performed the miracles in an extraordinary fashion, and with almighty power he voluntarily accepted the experience of his life-giving sufferings' (p. 212 below).

Even, however, after dismissing the charge that the monoenergists deprived Christ's human nature of its proper operation, we might still suspect that that they reduced it to an utterly passive instrument manipulated at every stage by the divine operation. Some texts certainly give this impression, such as the *Ekthesis* of 636: 'At no time did his intellectually ensouled flesh make its natural movement separately and of its own impulse in opposition to the bidding of God the Word ... but when, how, and to the extent that God the Word himself resolved' (p. 229 below). But the advocates of orthodox dyoenergism said exactly the same. To cite Sophronius of Jerusalem: 'Having become a human being, he accepted what was human voluntarily ... when and to the extent that he willed it.'¹¹ Or take Pope Martin in the Lateran Acts: 'He allowed these wholly blameless emotions to be excited in him according to his will' (p. 372 below). Such passages should surely be taken to assert not that the human nature lacked all spontaneity, but that the divine will retained overall control and was able to suspend, at will, the natural human operation, as when (for example) Christ walked on water without sinking.¹²

We may conclude that the difference between monoenergists and

9 Leo, *ep.* 124.5, ACO II. 4, p. 161, 10–11. Hilary, *De trinitate* 9.5 attributes to Christ 'saying and doing as man everything that is of God, and saying and doing as God everything that is of man' – cited in the Lateran Acts, p. 333 below.

10 Maximus, *ep.* 19, PG 91. 593A.

11 *Synodical Letter*, ACO² II/1, p. 452, 7–8.

12 Such suspensions of the laws of nature appeared far less problematic to ancient exegetes than they do to modern ones. Take the comment of Gregory of Nyssa, as cited at the Lateran Synod (p. 308, §22 below), on Mt 4:2, 'Having remained for forty days without food, afterwards he became hungry.' Taking 'afterwards' literally, Gregory understand this to mean that for forty days Christ's Godhead protected his manhood from feeling hungry.





dyoenergists was one of terminology rather than of substance, and that the two rival formulae could have been combined – in an affirmation of two natural operations, united in Christ to form one theandric operation, as proposed to Maximus by representatives of Patriarch Peter of Constantinople in 658.¹³ We may still feel, however, that the dyoenergists got the better of the argument. As we have noted, two natures implied two operations virtually by definition. The expression ‘one operation’ fitted neatly with the miaphysite assertion of ‘one composite nature’ in Christ, but was a confusing phrase in the context of Chalcedonian dyophysitism. This basic drawback led to the disavowal of monoenergism by Sergius of Constantinople. He continued, however, to speak of ‘one will’ in Christ – the monothelete formula that required much the same explanation as monoenergism but was easier to combine with Chalcedon.

Christ’s human will

One of the florilegia read out at Session V of the Lateran Synod – entitled ‘On the natural wills of Christ our God’ (pp. 316–22 below) – gives many passages from fourth- and fifth-century fathers relating to human volition in Christ, as distinct from his exercise of divine volition in union with the other two persons of the Trinity. The vast majority of these texts relate to a single episode in the gospels – the Agony in the Garden, at Gethsemane, where Christ acknowledged a conflict of will within himself: ‘Father, if you wish, take this cup from me, but let not my will but yours be done’ (Lk 22:42).¹⁴ This passage had often been treated by the fathers of the fourth century, keen to explain that it did not support the Arian doctrine of the inferiority of the Son to the Father even in his divine nature. So, for example, Gregory of Nyssa:¹⁵

He who does not wish his own will to be done certainly has this desire, that what he wants should not come about. Then how can there be brought to fulfilment the prayer of one who says ‘What I want is that what-I-want should not come about’? ... For this puzzle in reasoning there is but one remedy – the

13 Letter of Maximus to Anastasius in Allen and Neil (2002) 120. Pope Vitalian appears to have accepted this compromise: Allen and Neil (2002) 24–5.

14 The Matthaean version of this saying (‘Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me; yet not as I will but as you will’, 26:39) was also much cited. In contrast, that in Mark (‘Father, all things are possible to you; remove this cup from me; yet not what I will but what you will’, 14:36) was ignored.

15 *Antirrheticus*, *Opera* III/1, p. 181, 1–28.





true confession of the mystery, namely that the dread at the passion pertained to the human weakness ... while the acceptance of the passion as a result of the dispensation pertained to the divine purpose and power. Since therefore the human will and the divine will were different, the one who had appropriated our emotions uttered, as from his manhood, what fitted the weakness of this nature, and he added a second utterance, expressing a wish that the high and divine purpose should be confirmed (in contradiction to the human one) for the salvation of mankind. For by saying 'not mine' he indicated by word the human purpose, but by adding 'yours' he showed the conjunction of his own Godhead with the Father ... for in speaking of the Father's will he revealed also that of the Son.

This analysis may be found in many patristic writers from the fourth and into the seventh century: Christ displayed two contrary volitions at Gethsemane, with 'Take this cup from me' expressing the recoil from the cup by the human will, while 'Let not my will but yours be done' (the 'second utterance') expressed the overruling of the human will by the divine will, common to both Father and Son, which ordained the saving passion.

But did Christ as man not wish to die for our salvation? The standard explanation of his recoil from the cup was that it was simply the instinctive human reaction to the prospect of death. Why should Christ have allowed this to operate within his own perfected manhood? His motive, according to the fathers, was to refute those who doubted the reality of his human nature. As John Chrysostom put it in a passage cited at the Lateran Synod (p. 327, §27 below), 'the flesh not wishing to die is no reason for condemnation; for this is natural, and he displayed all the characteristics of nature apart from sin, and this in abundance, to stop the mouths of the heretics'. Such passages seem to reduce Christ's human will to a sub-rational drive.

In this context the fathers often applied the notion of 'appropriation', with soteriological implications: Christ was not distressed at the thought of what he himself was to suffer, but appropriated within his own manhood the distress that *we* experience in such situations, in order to overcome our weakness and teach us to accept the will of God. Amongst the examples cited in the Lateran Acts is the following passage, taken from St Ambrose (p. 317, §4 below):

For he would have bestowed nothing on me if he had not assumed my disposition. For tormented on my account was the one who on his own account did not have a mode or manner of being tormented ... He assumed my distress, so that he might bestow on me his own joy. He condescended to our infirmities





to the point of actual distress at death, entering on the experience voluntarily, so that through his own sufferings he might call us back to life.

This interpretation does not deny to Christ's manhood real feelings of distress at the approach of his passion, but attributes them to his decision to share *our* feelings at the thought of death, in order to conquer these feelings in a manner beneficial for the whole human race.¹⁶

Monothelitism

In all, the tradition asserted a conflict of wills at Gethsemane, but sought to reduce the apparent scandal by explaining how this contributed to the purposes of the incarnation. The monothelites went further: they denied that there had ever been two opposing wills or volitions in Christ, and asserted that his will was 'one'.¹⁷

Already in the seventh century and repeatedly since, this has been understood to deny the existence in Christ of a human faculty of will (or what Maximus called a human 'natural will') – akin to the classic Apollinarian error of denying Christ a rational soul. This interpretation of monothelitism has its champions even today.¹⁸ The contrary position is that the monothelites wished simply to insist on a perfect accord between Christ's divine will and his human will. The following arguments may be advanced against the Apollinarian interpretation:

(1) The fact that the monothelites were accused of Apollinarianism proves nothing, for Maximus and his allies accused them of a whole host of incompatible errors – of a miaphysite confusion of the natures, of a Nestorian division of Christ into two persons, of treating the human will of Christ as divine and of denying Christ any operation, whether human or divine.¹⁹ These allegations illustrate a standard, and regrettable, feature of patristic polemic – the attribution to one's opponents of tenets that they did not hold but which could (arguably) be deduced from the tenets they did. Maximus' contention (repeated in our Acts) was that the language of one

16 For patristic exegesis of the Gethsemane prayer see also Bathrellos (2004) 140–7.

17 This was not a seventh-century novelty. In around 550 Patriarch Menas of Constantinople had asserted the oneness of will in Christ in his Address to Pope Vigilius; see Brock (1985) 37–8. But such explicit statements were exceptional before the monothelite controversy.

18 For example, Léthel (1979); Bathrellos (2004); Hovorun (2008).

19 For these incompatible charges see pp. 362–3 below. The same are advanced by Maximus in the *Disputation at Bizye*, in Allen and Neil (2002) 82–4, 100–2.





operation or one will was compatible with every possible Christological position except the orthodox one. This is no evidence at all of what the monotheletes themselves believed and intended.

(2) There are texts that combine monotheletism with an explicit reference to human volition in Christ. The sixth-century miaphysite Themistius, cited as an ally of the monotheletes at the Lateran Synod, wrote: ‘We are not, because the sacred Athanasius said that Christ displayed two volitions at the time of his passion, going for this reason to ascribe two wills to him, and these fighting with each other according to these syllogisms of yours, but we shall piously acknowledge that the one will as of the one Emmanuel is in part moved humanly and in part divinely’ (p. 352, §18 below). A similar statement was made by the monothelete bishop Theodosius during his disputation with Maximus: ‘We too acknowledge the natures and different operations, namely divine and human, and that his Godhead is endowed with will and his manhood endowed with will, since his soul was not without a will. But we do not say two, lest we present him as being at war with himself.’²⁰

(3) The term ‘will’ was used to refer not only to deliberate choices but to a whole range of impulses and wishes. We have seen how the ‘will’ of Christ that recoiled from the passion was generally taken not as a willed rejection of the passion but as simply an instinctive aversion. Or take Maximus the Confessor, who defined ‘will’ (θέλημα, θέλησις) as the simple, natural desire for existence and whatever sustains existence, and distinguished it from the exercise of choice (προαίρεσις).²¹ Likewise, Augustine was cited at the Lateran Synod (p. 320, §9) as including ‘desire and joy’ among ‘volitions’ (θέληματα). This loose and all-embracing talk of ‘will’ made it impossible for anyone, even the monotheletes, to deny Christ a human will.

This final point may raise a suspicion that the monotheletes failed to recognise the presence in Christ’s manhood of a rational will, or at least to assign any role to it; it was all too easy to reduce his human ‘will’ to sub-rational human drives or responses. To take one example, at Constantinople III Constantine of Apamea, after insisting that Christ had but one will, and that this one will was identical to that of God the Father and the Holy Spirit, added that Christ did indeed have a natural

²⁰ Ibid., 96.

²¹ Maximus, *opusc.* 1, PG 91. 11C–12A, on which see Berthold (2010). And note how in the *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91. 321C) he includes among volitions cases in the gospels of mere velleity (e.g. Mk 7:24 and 9:29).





human will, in the sense of a desire for such things as food, drink and sleep;²² his rational will is forgotten. But this weakness was common to the whole tradition. Accounts of Gethsemane said nothing about Christ's rational will. It is typical that, when in his *Synodical Letter* Sophronius of Jerusalem lists the human operations of Christ, he concentrates on bodily experiences – such as growth, hunger, weariness and pain – that involve neither reason nor will.²³ Even where the monothelite treatment of will in Christ was defective, it was no worse than that of many of their opponents, or that of the great orthodox fathers of previous centuries.

Unfortunately, the seventh-century controversy between monothelites and dyothelites actually flourished on a perpetuation of this neglect of the rational will in Christ's humanity. The easiest way for the dyothelites to press their case was to adduce the strong biblical and patristic support for recognising human impulses in Christ with an appeal to his words at Gethsemane as evidence that these constituted a distinct human 'will'. Meanwhile, the easiest way for the monothelites to press their case was likewise to concentrate on the sub-rational drives in Christ, and then to insist that these did not constitute a second 'will'. Nor did it help that the aim of both parties in the debate was to prove their own position to be that of orthodoxy, in opposition to the 'heretical innovation' of their opponents; and orthodoxy was understood to mean the supposedly changeless tradition that had found classic expression in the great church fathers of earlier centuries, particularly in the golden age from Nicaea to Chalcedon. But these fathers had paid scant attention to Christ's rational will. This was not a context that encouraged serious analysis.

Nevertheless, the more intelligent minds of the time were well aware of the need to do more than pile up patristic texts. The notion of a 'development' of doctrine was alien, but there was always scope for 'clarification'. The debate led the best minds on both sides to scrutinise the human operation of Christ with a new attentiveness. Even though the language of progress was avoided and 'innovation' remained a dirty word, the result was a theological advance to which both parties contributed.

22 ACO² II/2, pp. 696,19–698,15.

23 ACO² II/2, pp. 448,15–452,2.





Seventh-century developments

The monotheletes rightly perceived that the Agony in the Garden, as recounted in scripture and understood in the tradition, did not constitute a real conflict of will. They argued that it was both misleading and shocking to pious ears to interpret Gethsemane as a conflict between two wills in Christ, one of which accepted, and one of which shunned, the passion. Accordingly the *Ekthesis* rejects 'an assertion of two wills opposed to each other, with God the Word willing the accomplishment of the saving passion and his manhood resisting and opposing his will; this introduces two [persons] with opposing wills, which is impious and alien to Christian doctrine' (p. 229 below).

To explain the two opposed 'wills' at Gethsemane appeal was made, as earlier fathers had done, to the notion of appropriation, by which the opposition of 'my will' and 'thy will' at Gethsemane was translated into an opposition between the will of fallen human beings on the one hand and the will of the Godhead on the other. But what did this mean for the human will of Christ himself? Pope Honorius' ill-fated assertion of one will in Christ deserves an attentive reading: 'We acknowledge one will of the Lord Jesus Christ, since manifestly our nature was assumed by the Godhead but not the sin in it – namely the nature created before sin, not the one corrupted in consequence of the transgression.'²⁴ The implication is that Christ's human will was akin to that of Adam before the Fall, as a rational will that obeyed the divine will and was therefore 'one' with it.²⁵

Such a will could itself be termed a 'divine' will. To cite Stephen of Antioch (a monothelete presbyter) at Constantinople III, Adam 'before the fall had a divine will and shared a will with God'.²⁶ Gregory of Nyssa, as cited by both Maximus and the Lateran Synod, had expressed himself similarly: 'For the body by producing cures through touch indicated the Godhead within it, while the soul displayed the divine power by that divine volition'²⁷ – a passage rightly interpreted by the dyotheletes as referring to

²⁴ Letter to Sergius, ACO² II/2, p. 550, 16–19.

²⁵ Pope John IV defended Honorius' 'monotheletism' as simply a denial that there was a conflict within Christ's manhood between a good will and an evil will (see his letter to Constans II, PL 129. 562C–564A and Schacht (1936) 236–8). This was not a sophistical defence (as modern writers constantly assert) but a correct understanding of Honorius' intention.

²⁶ ACO² II/1, p. 244, 14–15.

²⁷ Maximus, *Disputation with Pyrrhus*, PG 91. 317A, and p. 325, §24 below, both citing





a human act of will. This we must bear in mind when reading a statement such as the following, made by Macarius of Antioch at Constantinople III: the Word incarnate underwent the sufferings of the flesh ‘with one, sole divine will, since there was not in him another will or one resisting his divine and powerful volition’.²⁸ In view of the parallels just given, this statement should be taken not as denying but as asserting a human will in Christ.

Paul of Constantinople, in his letter to Pope Theodore read out at the Lateran Synod, likewise affirmed that there was but one will in Christ, but his interpretation of the formula is notable. He asserted not simply that the ‘will’ of the flesh was under the control of the Godhead (as earlier fathers had often done) but that ‘his flesh with its rational and intellectual soul ... possessed the divine will of the Word ... and was not averse to the suffering salvific for the world or at variance with the Father and with the indwelling Word’ (p. 258 below). In this account the manhood was not simply tamed and its rebellion suppressed, as in many previous interpretations of Gethsemane, but it accepted the passion in a rational act of the human will, which thereby became ‘one’ with the divine will. This appreciation of the ‘divine will’ shared by Christ’s ‘rational and intellectual soul’, even at Gethsemane itself, represented a real advance over earlier patristic interpretations.

If this was the contribution of the monothelites to a better understanding of Christ, it was curiously similar to what we find in the greatest and most zealous of their opponents, St Maximus the Confessor.

Maximus the Confessor

If we are to believe the account of the early years of Maximus the Confessor given in the nearly contemporary Syriac Life, he began his career as a monk in the Palestinian monastery of the Palaea Lavra, in which case he may well have known Sophronius, the future Patriarch of Jerusalem, from an early age. He certainly met him when they were both at Carthage in around 632, and under his influence became enrolled in the

De tridui spatio, Opera IX, p. 292, 6–13. In extant manuscripts of Gregory ‘that divine volition’ is a less common reading than ‘that powerful volition’. Cp. also Anastasius of Sinai, *Hodegos* II, 4, 16–18 (CCSG 8, 40), which asserts the presence in human beings of a ‘divine will’, in the sense of a natural drive to surpass nature.

²⁸ ACO² II/1, p. 224, 7–11. Macarius is echoing the phrase from Gregory of Nyssa I have just cited, and combines the two alternative readings of it mentioned in the previous note.





anti-monoenergist cause.²⁹ His position is well stated in his *Opusculum* 7, dating to around 640:³⁰

As human by nature, he willed those things that are naturally human. He kept the dispensation pure of all illusion, yet in no respect offering resistance to the will of the Father. For nothing that is natural, and certainly no nature itself, would ever resist the Author of nature.

So the innate drives of human nature produced in Christ both suffering and a free submission to the same. As Maximus proceeds to relate, both of these reached a climax at Gethsemane:³¹

That he had by nature a human will, as also a divine one in essence, the Word himself manifests clearly in the human deprecation of death, when he said, 'Father, if it is possible, let the cup pass from me', in order to show the weakness of his own flesh. So his flesh was acknowledged by those who saw him not to deceive the senses by an illusion; he was truly and properly a human being. But that again his will was wholly deified and assented to the divine will itself, since it is always moved and shaped by it and in accordance with it, was clear when ... he said as a human being, 'Let not my will but yours be done', giving himself as a type and example for us of renouncing our own will through a perfect fulfilment of the divine, even if we see death to be imminent.

Keeping the dispensation (that is, the incarnation) 'pure of illusion' was the traditional explanation of why God the Word allowed the manhood he assumed to continue to be subject to human needs and emotions. Yet, as Maximus proceeds to point out, the very words with which Christ at Gethsemane expressed a recoil from the 'cup' expressed at the very same time an acceptance of the passion on the part of his human will ('Let not my will be done'); even the recoil from the passion was not contrary to the divine will, since the Word wished thereby to prove the reality of the flesh he had assumed. Gethsemane proved the reality of both his divine and human wills, and at the same time the absence of even a momentary dissension between them.³² To appreciate this required a proper analysis of Christ's human will: Maximus was the first of the fathers to offer one, and

29 Maximus a few years later described Sophronius as his 'blessed master, father and teacher' (*ep.* 13, PG 91. 533A).

30 PG 91. 80A. Louth (1996) 180–91 provides a translation of this treatise.

31 PG 91. 80CD, citing Mt 26:39 and Lk 22:42.

32 Cp. Maximus, *opusc.* 6, PG 91. 68A: Christ's words at Gethsemane expressed 'the perfect assent of the human will to his divine and paternal will'.





therefore the first of the fathers to offer a satisfying interpretation of the gospel narrative.

What enabled in this case the perfect submission of the human will? In this passage Maximus insists that Christ not only accepted the passion but did so inevitably, since uncorrupted human nature naturally obeys its Creator, quite apart from the hypostatic union between the two natures in Christ. In another treatise (*Opusculum* 3) he draws a distinction between a 'natural' will (the innate impulse of uncorrupted nature) and a 'deliberative' or (to use his preferred term) 'gnomic' will, which has become disengaged from its roots and needs to deliberate prior to action.³³ The same point is made more briefly in *Opusculum* 7: 'His will was in no respect opposed to God, for it was not gnomic at all but purely natural, being always moulded and moved by his divinity in essence so as to fulfil the dispensation.'³⁴

In a later treatise (*Opusculum* 16) he defined the 'gnomic will' (γνώμη) more precisely, and argued that the assertion of such a will in Christ would constitute the Nestorian error of dividing him into two persons.³⁵

It is a self-willed impulse that brings about deviations in either direction, an impulse distinctive not of nature but precisely of person and hypostasis. This was known to Nestorius, the one who split [the natures] and worshipped a mere man by impiously defining a union of gnomic wills, in order to confirm a distinction of hypostases and to preserve a mere man, as the creator of the union (as he asserts) by means of a gnomic and self-willed movement towards God the Word, bringing about an identity of will, or rather (to speak more properly) a plurality of wills.

For Maximus, in contrast, Christ had a human faculty of will which did not merely agree with the divine will through an accident of choice but was controlled and directed by it, in virtue of its own spontaneous cleaving to the good. In the words of Maximus' faithful expositor John of Damascus, 'the soul of the Lord willed when moved in self-determination, but in self-determination it willed those things that his divine will willed it to will'.³⁶

But this is not to say that the human will was totally passive and capable of being moved by the Godhead in any direction whatsoever, for

33 *Opusc.* 3, PG 91. 45C–48A, trans. Louth (1996) 193.

34 PG 91. 81D.

35 PG 91. 192BC. This treatise is dated by Sherwood (1952) to after 643.

36 John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei* 62 (III. 18) 71–2, in *Schriften*, ed. B. Kotter, II, 160.





it preserved a natural impulse towards what accorded with its own nature. In consequence, it experienced human needs and emotions, and this set up a tension within it when at Gethsemane Christ faced his passion. But the deepest impulse of the uncorrupted will was bound to prevail, and this impulse seeks union with the divine, since human beings, made in the image of God, can only find their fulfilment in God. The human will, when it is not constrained (as in fallen human beings) by ignorance of the good and the force of passions contrary to reason, is freely but inevitably in alignment with the divine will. Earlier treatments of human drives in Christ had restricted themselves to the impulses of hunger, weariness, fear of death, and the like; Maximus' recognition of an exalted and yet fully human drive in Christ, uniting his created will to the divine will, was a momentous theological advance.

The contribution of the Lateran Synod

It is agreed in modern scholarship that the theological content of the synodal acts was provided by Greek monks permanently or temporally resident in Rome.³⁷ The theological discourses with which the acts are punctuated are manifestly the products of a Greek mind. Maximus the Confessor was one of these monks, and it is not to be doubted that his was the dominant mind and voice among them. A linguistic analysis, to determine the extent of Maximus' contribution to the precise wording of these speeches, has yet to be conducted.³⁸ But the question of the extent to which his distinctive ideas find expression in our acts can, and needs, be addressed.

The synodal canons define that there are two wills and two operations in Christ, within a reaffirmation of earlier orthodoxy, notably the teaching of Constantinople II (553) on unity in Christ. In this context they use one significant phrase deriving from Maximus: both the two wills and the two operations are said to be 'connaturally united'³⁹ – that is, united in such a way that, despite their difference in character, no division or boundary can be perceived between them.

The canons are preceded by a series of long and intricate speeches in

³⁷ See p. 62 above.

³⁸ In the interim the judgement of Riedinger (1982) 121 may be respected: 'If the Acts of the Lateran Synod are here described as his [Maximus'] theological work, this does not, of course, apply to every individual word. But that they are to be counted among his works, according to the understanding of his time, should be considered proven.'

³⁹ See Canons 10–11, p. 379 below, with the notes *ad loc.*





which, likewise, we can hear the thought and surely the style of Maximus.⁴⁰ The emphasis is, yet again, on the Agony in the Garden. The speakers (Pope Martin and two Italian metropolitans) insist on the reality of Christ's human anguish, that it is not to be explained away as a mere 'representation' by Christ of a sorrow that was not his own. At the same time they deny a conflict of wills at Gethsemane, since Christ's human will was 'according to nature', the nature (that is) created by God, not the nature weakened by sin. The story of Gethsemane, therefore, is not the story of the conflict between a divine will that decreed the passion and a human will that resisted it, but of a human rational will that never veered from the divine will. Christ becomes a lesson for us of obedience to God, and a spiritual power that enables that obedience (pp. 374–5).

In all, the synodal acts constituted the formal adoption by a church council of the work of a living theologian. He himself remained unnamed, and his ideas were presented as the correct reading of the patristic tradition. Within the context of a traditionalism that rejected any thought of innovation, the fathers of the Lateran Synod had no alternative.

A debate real and unreal

To sum up, both monotheletes and dyotheletes in the seventh century were concerned to deny that Christ's human will at any stage recoiled from the saving passion, and this they did by reference to the subjection of Christ's human will to his divine will. This means that dyotheletism, as expounded by Maximus the Confessor, was not the enemy of monotheletism but its unwitting ally.⁴¹

It was inevitable in the context of contemporary polemics that both sides claimed to do no more than preserve the previous patristic tradition, but in fact they were more original than they were ready to admit. Take the following passage from Cyril of Alexandria, cited at the Lateran Synod (p. 331, §40 below):

Dread at suffering is present in him because of the manhood, but is calmed at once by the power and strength of the indwelling Word. For mark how the deprecation reveals the manhood in him, while the inflexibility of the Godhead immediately shone forth.

Texts such as this describe a quelling of the human impulse by the divine

40 For a fuller analysis see pp. 296–9 below and Börjessen (forthcoming).

41 As pointed out by Ohme (2008a) 342.





Word. This is to be distinguished from the affirmation we have found both in monothelites and in Maximus that the human will did not need to be quelled, since it itself accepted the passion. In consequence, the seventh century saw a replacement of the earlier treatment of Gethsemane, which depicted a simple opposition between Christ's divine and human wills, by a quite new appreciation of the harmony between the two wills, with the rational will of Christ siding with the divine will against the instinctive timidity of the flesh.

This at the same time made Christ the model for the willed submission to the Godhead of ordinary human beings; as Maximus expressed it in one of his letters, 'Love persuades the gnostic will to proceed according to nature, in no way rebelling against the principle of nature, according to which we can all have one nature, and likewise one gnostic will and one volition, with God and with each other.'⁴² The use in this passage (admittedly from early in Maximus' career) of monothelite, even miaphysite, terminology testifies to the common ground shared by Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians alike.

This doctrine of a full harmony of will in Christ was expressed by the monothelites in terms of 'one will', even 'one divine will', in Christ. Maximus the Confessor preferred to affirm two wills and operations, while arguing that the sinlessness of Christ's human nature, and its union with his Godhead, brought about unity of will. His careful analysis of the nature of volition surpassed anything the monothelites had to offer, and can be compared only to the thought of St Augustine, who, two centuries earlier, in the context of the Pelagian controversy over human freedom in the reception of grace, had likewise argued that true freedom of the will (*vera libertas*) involves guidance by the divine will, rather than a freedom that could be exercised against it.⁴³ Taken together, the teachings of Maximus and Augustine constitute a challenge, still relevant today, to notions of human freedom that demand human autonomy.⁴⁴

In all, the seventh-century debate over will in Christ was timely and productive, and led to a greatly improved appreciation of both the perfection and the cooperation of the two natures in Christ. It may be seen as the culmination of four centuries of Christological reflection. But its

42 *Ep.* 2, PG 91. 396C, dated by Sherwood (1952) to before 626.

43 See Fitzgerald (1999) 495–8.

44 The affinities that connect Maximus to Augustine have often been commented on. That in his long period in Africa and Italy he learnt about Augustine's thought and was influenced by it is not improbable. See Daley (2008).





102 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

true significance was obscured by the refusal of Maximus and his western allies to recognise their essential agreement with the monotheletes, who were as orthodox as they were. The war they initiated and pursued with such vehemence related to theological formulation rather than to a different understanding of Christ. Pope Theodore and Pope Martin were right to follow Maximus the Confessor in his analysis of will and operation in Christ, but their acceptance of his condemnation of monotheletism was a tragic error.





VI. THE RECEPTION OF THE SYNOD

Memory of the synod in the west

After the fall of Pope Martin the Roman see adopted a discreet silence over the synod and its decrees, that continued almost until the time of the Council of Constantinople of 680–1. In August 678 the emperor Constantine IV wrote to Pope Donus, proposing a council in Constantinople where the monothelete issue could be discussed between representatives of east and west.¹ It fell to Donus' successor Agatho to respond, and he sought synodal support in the west. Bede, in his *Ecclesiastical History* (IV. 17), relates that Abbot John of St Martin's was sent from Rome by Pope Agatho with a copy of the Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649 'to learn of what faith was the English church'. The result was the Synod of Haethfelth (or Hatfield in Hertfordshire), held on 17 September 680 and chaired by Theodore of Tarsus, archbishop of Canterbury and an overwhelming presence in the English church, who had earlier lived for a time in Constantinople and in Rome. Bede quotes a passage of its decree that, after listing the five ecumenical councils, continues: 'The synod held in the city of Rome, in the time of the blessed Pope Martin, in the eighth indiction, and in the ninth year of the most pious Emperor Constantine, we also acknowledge.' This is not short of claiming ecumenical authority for Martin's synod. Bede lets us know, almost accidentally, that the Synod of Haethfelth condemned monotheletism – doubtless its chief purpose, though not one that interested Bede.

The only other synod, as far as we know, that was held in the west in response to Agatho's need was that in Rome itself, on 27 March 680, attended by 125 bishops.² The synod sent a 'report' to Constantinople, preserved in the Acts of the ecumenical council that followed.³ This

1 The letter is in ACO² II/1, 2–10.

2 See Jankowiak (2009) 402–14.

3 ACO² II/1, 123–59.





document finally brought to an end the Roman silence over the synod of 649. After affirming two wills and operations in Christ, it continues:⁴

This rule of the pure catholic and apostolic confession was also taught synodically and defended resolutely by the holy council that convened under Pope Martin of apostolic memory in this city of Rome (which serves your most Christian rule), as is known to us all, whoever anywhere are humble priests of the churches of Christ. At this council the predecessors of our insignificance convened, and with a synodical proclamation preached the apostolic confession they had received from the beginning, and which they defined unambiguously and without the error of any novelty.

Constantinople showed awareness of Rome's pride over this early assertion of orthodoxy during the period of monothelete ascendancy. When in 713 Patriarch John VI of Constantinople wrote to Pope Constantine to explain away his own craven acquiescence in the temporary reassertion of monotheletism in Byzantium under the emperor Philippicus (711–713), he though it politic to refer to the synod of 649 with respect:⁵

To say that Christ exercises will and operation in each nature is no different than conceiving two natural wills and two natural operations. That it is specifically according to this understanding that these expressions are to be understood was laid down in advance in the definition issued by the sacred council convened in your great city of Rome in the time of Martin of venerable memory, who previously presided over your church.

A century later, during the Carolingian renaissance, which saw a revival of interest in the controversies and councils of late antiquity,⁶ we find a well-informed account of the monothelete controversy and the synod of 649 in the Chronicle of Ado of Vienne, dating to the middle of the ninth century. Ado interprets the *Typos* as denying Christ any operation, which suggests knowledge of the text of the synodal acts, as does also the singularly official wording he uses to date the synod: *anno nono imperii Constantini mense Octobri indictione octava*.⁷ It was in this same period that the copy of the Acts of 649 that Pope Martin had sent to Amandus of Maastricht was recopied – in a manuscript that is still extant and is our best witness to the Latin Acts – and that Milo of St Amand copied Martin's

4 ACO² II/1, p. 131, 19–25.

5 ACO² II/2, p. 904, 16–21.

6 For Carolingian interest in the literature of the Three Chapters controversy see Price (2009) I, 101.

7 PL 123. 113–14.





letter to Amandus into his *Life* of the saint.⁸ Thereafter the synod appears regularly in brief mentions in chronicles, such as those of Liutprand (tenth century), Hermann Contractus (eleventh century) and Orderic Vitalis (twelfth century).⁹ But the monothelite controversy had never loomed large in western consciousness. Remembering, or pretending not to remember, the synod was a matter of far greater significance in Byzantium.

Memory of the synod in the east

In the period that followed the arrest and disgrace of Pope Martin, the chief, indeed virtually the only, champion of the synod and its decrees (as long as he remained alive) was Maximus the Confessor.

His *Opusculum* 11, which must date to soon after the synod, speaks of 'six' ecumenical councils, with the clear implication that the Lateran Synod was itself this sixth council, a claim which the synod had not made for itself, at least explicitly.¹⁰ Then, a few years later, there are references to the synod in the Maximus trial literature, consisting of the *Relatio motionis* or *Record of the Trial* (in 655) and the *Disputation at Bizye* (in 656): these were propaganda produced by Maximus' circle, and were highly revelatory of how he viewed the synod that had been the climax of his anti-monothelite campaign and was now being studiously ignored. Each contains a discussion of the Lateran Synod and the authority of its decrees. Particularly notable is a passage in the *Disputation* where Maximus demands the acceptance of the synod's condemnation of Patriarchs Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul. His interlocutor, Bishop Theodosius, replies that the synod was invalid because it was held without a command from the emperor. Maximus replies that it is not imperial convocation but soundness of doctrine that makes a council authoritative.¹¹

Maximus, however, was not only in disgrace during the period of monothelite ascendancy but remained so even at the Council of

8 See in this volume pp. 79–80 and 391–3.

9 The references are, respectively, PL 136. 1005, PL 143. 141, and PL 188. 218 (*Hist. Eccl.* II. 27).

10 The Maximus reference is PG 91. 137D. The style of the Acts of 649 imitates so closely that of the acts of ecumenical councils that a claim to ecumenical significance is suggested. But the synod's encyclical letters urge churches to hold similar synods locally (p. 403 below), which excludes a claim to ecumenical authority.

11 *Disputation at Bizye*, in Allen and Neil (2002) 88. The relevant passage in the *Relatio motionis* is *ibid.* 70–2.





Constantinople III (680–1), which vindicated dyotheletism and repeated the Lateran Synod's condemnation of the patriarchs Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul (and others), and yet pretended not to have heard of the Lateran Synod, Pope Martin or Maximus the Confessor.¹² The reason, doubtless, was their rejection of imperial authority; in contrast, Constantinople III was dominated, and even chaired, by the emperor Constantine IV.

But the position was to change with the iconoclast controversy of the eighth and ninth centuries. At Nicaea II (787) Maximus was claimed as an iconophile and described as 'the ever-memorable Maximus, who is praised by all the churches'.¹³ In Session IV two passages briefly expressive of devotion to icons of Christ and Our Lady were read out from his *Disputation at Bizye*.¹⁴ This is on the slight side as a patristic testimony to the veneration of icons, but what is significant is the treatment as authoritative of the Maximus trial literature, despite its tendentious and anti-imperial character. But if this had previously placed Maximus beyond the pale, the situation was transformed in the context of the struggle, led by monks, against the iconoclasm imposed by the emperors Leo III (717–741) and Constantine V (741–775). Maximus was now a forebear to be remembered and imitated.

Knowledge of the Maximus trial literature is also shown by an iconodule pamphlet, dating to the first years of the ninth century (or thereabouts), which takes the fictitious form of two letters from Pope Gregory II (d. 731) to the emperor Leo III.¹⁵ Gregory rebukes the emperor for his 'arrogance and pride', telling him that he is detested by the whole world and even mocked by little children.¹⁶ He compares any threat of violence from the emperor to the way in which Constans II had maltreated Pope Martin: 'Misled over the doctrine of the holy Trinity [*sic*] and following the then heretical patriarchs Sergius, Paul and Pyrrhus, he sent and seized him by force, bringing him to Byzantium, and after gravely maltreating him, sent him into exile.'¹⁷ And this, even though Martin and his successors represent St Peter, 'whom all the kingdoms of the west hold to be God on earth'.¹⁸

12 It is notable that Anastasius of Sinai in his *Against the Monotheletes* 1 (dated to 700/1) refers to the sufferings of Martin but omits Maximus altogether.

13 Mansi XIII. 361D fin.

14 Acts of Nicaea II, ACO² III/2, 340–2, citing CCSG 39, pp. 115–17 [ll. 460–7] and 133 [ll. 646–51] = Allen and Neil (2002) 98–100 and 108 fin.

15 See Gouillard (1968) for both the text of the letters and a long introduction, and the important discussion in Dagron (2003) ch. 5.

16 Gouillard (1968) p. 281, 42–4; p. 285, 110–11; p. 287, 132–4.

17 Ibid. p. 295, 245–8.

18 Ibid. p. 297, 260–1.





Gregory then picks up a theme treated with great boldness in the Maximus trial literature – the error of regarding the emperor as a priest, and of allowing him to take part in the definition of doctrine. Maximus' rejection of this, and by implication of the Byzantine ideology of the emperor as God's image and representative, had caused deep shock in his lifetime. It is now consciously resurrected in the context of opposition to imperial iconoclasm.¹⁹ Not that the forger of the Gregory letters was as bold as Maximus himself: he deflates his sails by adding that he is denying authority in church affairs not to orthodox but only to heretical emperors.²⁰ While Maximus had declared forthrightly that an emperor is not a priest, the forger of the Gregory letters exhorts Leo III 'to 'become a high priest and emperor' – by switching to orthodoxy.²¹ But the point of importance for the standing of Maximus, Pope Martin and the Lateran Synod is that the very characteristic that had led to their disgrace in the seventh century – the assertion of orthodoxy in direct disobedience to imperial authority – was now the cause of their rehabilitation.

Other texts of this time do not have the same polemical and political slant, but celebrate the victims of monothelitism as models of the defence of orthodoxy at the price of personal sacrifice. We have a Greek *Life of Pope Martin* that concentrates on the maltreatment he suffered as a martyr for the truth and offers a curious account of the Lateran Synod.²² It tells how 'the sacred Maximus the Confessor' went to Rome, where he found 'bishops and hegumens of the orthodox faith who had been persecuted by the heretics': the reference must be to exiles and refugees from the Greek East. Maximus persuades Martin to convene a synod, at which 'bishops, hegumens and monks from all the east gave information about the most impious heresy by petitions and speech'. Martin is persuaded, and has the heretics excommunicated and a 'definition of piety' issued. This is very much an eastern account, in which it is Greek monks who lead and popes who meekly follow.

19 Ibid. pp. 301–3.

20 Ibid. p. 299. This represents an attempt to water down Maximus' position, as can also be observed in the Greek *Life of Maximus*. See Dagron (2003) 171–3.

21 Cp. Maximus in Allen and Neil (2002) 56 to Ps.-Gregory in Gouillard, p. 305, 377.

22 Peeters (1933) esp. 254–5. The text ends with a mention of the Trullan Canon 82 'on the venerable holy images' (p. 262), which is so irrelevant for Pope Martin that it dates the work to the time of the iconoclast controversy. A number of scholars have proposed a date in the first period of official iconoclasm (730–740); see most recently Roosen (2010) 428. But there is nothing to exclude a date in the latter half of the eighth or even the ninth century; see Booth (2013a) 145–6.





Recent research has suggested that this Life of Martin was produced in tandem with the first Greek hagiographic text devoted to Maximus (the so-called *Urpessio*), which is further evidence of a desire to rehabilitate him in this period.²³ Meanwhile, there is a recognition of Maximus' role at the Lateran Synod in a chapter entitled 'Account of the monothelete heresy, its origin, and various local councils' in a late ninth-century Byzantine text (presumably incorporating older material) entitled *A collection and exposition of all the holy ecumenical and local councils*.²⁴ This text not only mentions the synod but shows knowledge of the Acts, since it refers to synods held – 'through the zeal and assistance of Maximus the Confessor' – in Byzacena, Numidia, Mauretania and Carthage.²⁵ It says of the Synod of 649:²⁶

The sainted Martin, who after Theodore was entrusted with the rule of Rome by divine decree, assembled a council of many bishops, with whom there sat also the great Maximus the Confessor, at which Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and all who were of the heresy of the monotheletes were subjected to anathema, and a decree in chapters was issued which clearly defined two wills and two operations in Christ our God.

In contrast, the first full Greek Life of Maximus, dating to the tenth century,²⁷ does not even mention the Lateran Synod, which may serve to remind us that there is no explicit statement from the seventh century that Maximus played a role therein. This makes it all the more striking that ancient commentators, like modern ones, presumed (with good reason) that he must have been the dominant influence behind the scenes.

In all, memory of the Lateran Synod revived in Byzantium in the context of the revolt against imperial iconoclasm. This led to the rehabilitation of Maximus the Confessor as a champion of orthodoxy against government oppression; it led also to veneration of his ally Pope Martin and to a new interest in and respect for the work of the synod. This became part of the story of the triumph of orthodoxy, a victory that was attributed to heroic monks and confessors, to some emperors but not others, and never (as leaders) to the distant popes of Rome.

23 Roosen (2010) esp. 427–33.

24 *Konzilssynopse, Eine unbekannte*, ed. Hoffmann and Brandes, 166–73.

25 Cp. the African letters in the Acts of 649 (pp. 161–80 above) that reveal the holding of anti-monothelete synods (or plans for the same) in 646. See our critical discussion of this material, p. 135.

26 *Konzilssynopse*, 170.

27 For the date see most recently Roosen (2010).





THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649







THE FIRST SESSION¹

SUMMARY²

[8] The First Act indicates in a clear account the cause of the spiritual or legal and canonical meeting for a common purpose of the most holy high priests, enthusiasts for those men and those doctrines that are all-sacred. This meeting they conducted indeed in concord, and [concluded] that the heretics are answerable for everything, and that, with the accusers either being present or bringing charges against them in writing, the most sacred bishops ought to carry out in a fair manner a just, that is the prescribed, examination and judgement, by recourse to their writings, [with the meeting] refuting the perverse *Ekthesis* [exposition] of their impious heresy.

INTRODUCTION

The first session of the synod took place on 5 October 649. It was opened by Theophylact, the *primicerius* (or chief) of the notaries of the Roman see, who invited Pope Martin to introduce the business of the synod, which he proceeded to do in a long address that anticipates the synod's deliberations and conclusions.

Martin (in the speech here ascribed to him) singles out four eastern patriarchs, alive or recently deceased, as deserving condemnation – Cyrus of Alexandria for adopting monoenergism in his *Plerophoria* of 633, Sergius of Constantinople for composing the monothelete *Ekthesis* of 638,

1 The Latin title is *primus secretarius*, the 'first consistory'. The same term is used in the acts of the other sessions.

2 The summaries of the sessions are taken, without change, from the Greek Acts, where they come immediately after the attendance lists; they are absent from the Latin Acts. The poor quality of the Greek of this first summary in particular points to a late and undefinable date of composition, of which the only definite *terminus ante quem* is the late thirteenth-century date of our oldest MS.





Pyrrhus formerly of Constantinople for approving the *Ekthesis*, and Paul of Constantinople for composing the *Typos* of 648, which forbade any further debate over wills and operations in Christ. Martin places his own interpretation on these documents, arguing that the *Ekthesis*, by adopting monotheletism, was also endorsing monoenergism (despite its explicit statement to the contrary) and that the *Typos*, in forbidding the assertion of either one or two wills and operations in Christ, deprived Christ of all will and operation and thereby of any real existence.

Martin attempts to show that his own doctrine of two operations and two wills in Christ is traditional, supported by both the church fathers and the ecumenical councils. He cites passages from the fathers that argue unity of essence in the Trinity from unity of will and operation; these are taken from florilegia that appear in full in the acts of Session V. In support of two operations he cites a famous sentence in the Tome of Pope Leo the Great on the two natures of Christ: 'Each form in communion with the other operates what is proper to it.' He claims that this has the full authority of the Council of Chalcedon, since its Definition hailed the Tome as 'a pillar of the orthodox faith'; in fact, the Definition called the Tome 'a universal pillar against those with false beliefs',³ canonizing its refutation of Eutychianism and Nestorianism but not adopting all its positive assertions. Scripture is also appealed to, in its ascription to the incarnate Christ of the 'passions' or sufferings – the cross and also hunger and thirst, distress and fear – and also of human acts of will; the examples given of the latter do not, surprisingly, include the famous prayer at Gethsemane ('Let not my will but yours be done', Lk 22:42), but concentrate on verses where Christ is attributed with preferences which, since not all were fulfilled, cannot be attributed to the sovereign will of his Godhead. This argument is manifestly indebted to Maximus the Confessor, who cites the same verses in his *Disputation with Pyrrhus*.⁴

Martin concludes by claiming that appeals to him to reassert orthodoxy had been received from 'almost the whole world'. In fact (as is plain from the documents read out at Session II), the protests came essentially from two quarters – from Africa and from churchmen of Palestinian origin, like Maximus himself. He calls on the assembled bishops to carry out a thorough investigation of the dangerous 'innovation' introduced by their opponents.

3 Price and Gaddis (2005) II, 203.

4 The disputation took place in 645, but Noret (1999) argues that the written account dates to a decade later.





The pope's speech is followed by the reading of an apology for absence from Bishop Maurus of Ravenna, presented by his two representatives at the synod, Bishop Maurus of Cesena and Deusdedit, one of his presbyters. Maurus' long episcopate of almost thirty years was dominated by his resistance to Roman claims of jurisdiction over his see,⁵ and this may account for his absence, but he accepted the teaching authority of the Roman see, and his letter contains an unimpeachable dyoenergist profession. At two points in the letter he gives explicit approval in advance to whatever the synod might decree. There is a problem here: the Latin text of the letter is accepted by modern scholarship as primary,⁶ but at both these points the Latin is manifestly a poor translation from Greek.⁷ A plausible hypothesis is that, when the letter was being translated into Greek for inclusion in the synodal acts, additions were inserted (first in Greek and then, derivatively, in the Latin text), to transform the text from a general profession of orthodoxy into an explicit confirmation in advance of the synod's decrees.

There follows a speech ascribed to Bishop Maximus of Aquileia, which develops the argument that a denial of two operations and wills in Christ implies a denial of his two natures, in contradiction of the Council of Chalcedon and patristic tradition. He proceeds to propose that the synod should judge the monotheletes on the basis of complaints from no more than two accusers and of their own writings. There follows an intervention by Bishop Deusdedit of Cagliari in favour of this proposal. The final speech of the session, attributed to 'all the holy bishops' and addressed to Pope Martin, approves the proposal. This speech may be attributed to literary composition on the basis of episcopal acclamations.

TEXT

[2] In the name of our God and Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the ninth year of the reign of our master Constantine the most pious Augustus, three days before the Nones of October in the eighth indiction,⁸ there presided Martin the most holy and most blessed pope of the apostolic see of the city of Rome, with the holy and sacred and venerable gospels lying

5 See his entry in the ninth-century *Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiae Ravennatis* by Agnellus of Ravenna, CCCM 199, 280–6.

6 Riedinger (1996) 97.

7 See pp. 127–8 below, nn. 81 and 86.

8 5 October 649.





displayed,⁹ in the church of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ called the Constantinian,¹⁰ and there were seated together with him, to join in conducting the hearing, the most God-beloved priests¹¹ (2) Maximus bishop of Aquileia, (3) Deusdedit bishop of Cagliari, (4) Maurus bishop of Cesena and Deusdedit presbyter of Ravenna, the representatives of Maurus bishop of the same city of Ravenna, (5) Sergius bishop of Tempesa, (6) Reparatus bishop of Manturia, (7) Epiphanius bishop of Albanum, (8) Benedict bishop of Ajaccio, (9) [4] Julian bishop of Horta, (10) Papinius bishop of Vibo, (11) Maximus bishop of Pisaurum, (12) Lucian bishop of Leontium, (13) Viator bishop of Ortona, (14) Bonitus bishop of Formiae, (15) Majorianus bishop of Palestrina, (16) Germanus bishop of Numana, (17) Laurence bishop of Perusium, (18) Carosus bishop of Falerii, (19) Marcianus bishop of Mevania, (20) Barbatus bishop of Sutrium, (21) Calumniosus bishop of Halaesa, (22) Peregrinus bishop of Messana, (23) Romanus bishop of Cerillae, (24) Crescentius bishop of Locri, (25) Felix bishop of Agrigentum, (26) Marcellinus bishop of Clusium, (27) Geminianus bishop of Volaterrae, (28) Marinianus bishop of Populonia, (29) Luminosus bishop of Tifernum Tiberinum, (30) Potentinus bishop of Velitrae, (31) Maurus bishop of Tuscana, (32) Martin bishop of Gabii, (33) Adeodatus bishop of Spoleum, (34) John bishop of Paestum, (35) Gaudiosus bishop of Reate, (36) Laurence bishop of Tauriana, (37) John bishop of Tropeia, (38) Luminosus bishop of Salerno, (39) Sabbatius bishop of Buxentum, (40) John bishop of Tarentum, (41) Rufinus bishop of Sipontum, (42) Adeodatus bishop of Ameria, (43) Gaudiosus bishop of Capua, (44) Bonitus bishop of Ferentia, (45) Maurus bishop of Senegallica, (46) Maurosus bishop of Ancona, (47) Bonus bishop of Ficulae, (48) Fortunatus bishop of Auximum, (49) Thomas bishop of Lunae, (50) Bonitus bishop of Ferentum Polymartium, (51) Maximus bishop of Trecalae, (52) Paschalis bishop of Blanda [Julia], (53) Luminosus bishop of the Marsi, (54) Gloriosus bishop of Camerinum, (55) Decoratus bishop of Tibur, (56)

9 The placing of a gospel book on a throne dominating the proceedings was standard conciliar practice, regularly noted in conciliar acts. It signified that the supreme president of a council was Christ himself.

10 This is the Lateran Basilica, built by the emperor Constantine.

11 I correct the spelling of the personal names in the light of the Latin subscription list of Session V (pp. 384–7), which gives the same names in the same order and was presumably the source of the attendance lists (which are all identical). The numbering of the names is taken from the subscription list. For the location of the sees consult the maps and Index of Names.





Amabilis bishop of Ostia, (57) Albinus bishop of Portus, (58) Palumbus bishop of Fundi, (59) Theodosius bishop of Croton, (60) Scholasticus bishop of Fanum, (61) Helias bishop of Lilybaeum, (62) Aquilinus bishop of Assisium, (63) Eusebius bishop of Atella, (64) Martin bishop of Centumcellae, (65) Juventinus bishop of Stabiae, (66) Maurus bishop of Senae, (67) Laetus bishop of Luca, (68) Theodore bishop of Rosellae, (69) Andrew bishop of Ydruntum, (70) Justus bishop of Tauromenium, (71) Felix bishop of Panormus, (72) [6] Laurence bishop of Tuder, (73) John bishop of Carinae, (74) Albinus bishop of Signia, (75) Augustine bishop of Squillacium, (76) John bishop of Regium, (77) Barbatus bishop of Cumae, (78) Felix bishop of Terracina, (79) Oportunus bishop of Anagnia, (80) Firminus bishop of Blera, (81) Jovian bishop of Firmum, (82) Anastasius bishop of Narnia, (83) Theodore bishop of Tyndaris, (84) Sapienius bishop of Nomentum, (85) Maximus bishop of Misenum, (86) Gratosius bishop of Nepet, (87) Leontius bishop of Naples, (88) Paschalis bishop of Thermae [Himeriae], (89) Oportunus bishop of Pisae, (90) Donatus bishop of Mariana, (91) Bonosus bishop of Aleria, (92) Peregrinus bishop of Lipara, (93) Boethius bishop of [Forum] Corneli, (94) Valentinus bishop of Thurii, (95) Luminosus bishop of Bononia, (96) Crescentius bishop of [Forum] Livii, (97) Stephen bishop of [Forum] Popilii, (98) Callionistus bishop of Hatria, (99) John bishop of Vicosabinae, (100) Potentius bishop of Pola, (101) Leontius bishop of Faventia, (102) Donatus bishop of Sassina, (103) John bishop of the Unnogours,¹² (104) John bishop of Gabopolis, and (105) Victorinus bishop of Uzalis.

[8] {Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see,¹³ said:

Following 'Jesus who passed through the heavens',¹⁴ in an excellent imitation (as is right) in all your speech and conduct, your beatitude has assembled around yourself his sacred priests, who establish his covenant with bloodless sacrifices in the odour of spiritual sweetness,¹⁵ because of

12 The Unnogours were a nomadic people living north of the Black Sea but also as far west as the Pentapolis of Ravenna. See Jankowiak (2009) 255–7.

13 This is the Latin version. The Greek has simply 'the holy council', a vague formula that could be used of anyone (though normally a bishop and often a chairman) speaking on behalf of the assembled bishops. Perhaps the Greek wording was that in the draft minutes, prepared before the actual session, while the Latin reflects knowledge (after the event) of who actually spoke at this stage.

14 Heb 4:14.

15 Cp. Ps 49:5.





the affair of the outlandish innovation, an affair that is not unknown to them or to anyone else of those with zeal for piety, but which nevertheless needs to be publicized by them with greater precision, both for the refutation of this heresy and for the protection of the orthodox faith, for the sake of which (as has already been said) you have canonically convened them with apostolic authority. Therefore, ‘doing everything with wisdom’,¹⁶ deign (as is due) to recount the reason for their convocation, dear to God, so that the opening of your synodical proceedings may be lawful and fitting. May you give a rational account of the reason for this meeting to the most sacred high priests who have assembled and are presiding,¹⁷ whom indeed you outshine through your supreme sacred rule and enthronement, which in its apostolicity surpasses all those who exercise priesthood throughout the world.

Having therefore in yourself the God who said, ‘Open your mouth and I shall fill it,’¹⁸ as you open your lips wisely so that your mouth may utter his praise,¹⁹ give an account of the said matter to those who have assembled. ‘For a wise man who hears these things will be yet wiser,’ as it is written,²⁰ ‘the one with understanding will obtain guidance,’ and those who are taught will find vindication, above all through knowing with precision that this is the apostolic commandment and judgement by the God of Jacob.²¹ That you should ‘always be equipped to vindicate yourselves before everyone who asks you for an account of the hope that is in you’²² are the instructions of Peter the head of the apostles. This is, moreover, the injunction of the prophet Joel when he says, ‘Sound a trumpet in Sion, proclaim on the holy mountain that the day of the Lord has come; proclaim this, arouse the warriors,’²³ who share with you the panoply of the all-holy Spirit, to defend the catholic church and destroy all lawlessness. For in this way by your sacred address you will empower them all the more, with the result that ‘even the powerless will say “I am strong” and the gentle “I am a warrior”’,²⁴

16 Ps 103:24.

17 The reference is to Maximus of Aquileia, Deusdedit of Cagliari and Maurus of Ravenna (as represented at the synod), whose metropolitan status made them (officially) co-presidents of the council together with Pope Martin.

18 Ps 80:11b.

19 Cp. Ps 50:17.

20 Prov 1:5.

21 Cp. Ps 80:5.

22 1 Pt 3:15.

23 Joel 2:1, 4:9.

24 Cf. Joel 4:11.





for the demolition of the obstacles raised against the knowledge of God and for the confirmation of the divine doctrines, for which and through which both the approved fathers of the catholic church and the holy and ecumenical five councils [10] ratified the faith in our Lord and God Jesus Christ, from whom and in whom may you begin and conclude the spiritual combat on his behalf that lies before you, and put on a crown of honour and glory as a true champion and advocate of piety.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

The word of the gospel, salvific for all mankind, has embraced all the ends of the earth with the power of its most divine proclamation, wishing to make known that the only precise initiates and heralds are we the shepherds of the most faithful congregations and the priests of God the Word's great and most divine dispensation in the flesh, by which he girded on and renewed our nature. This word wrote (as you know, most God-beloved brethren) of 'shepherds who watched and kept guard by night',²⁵ when, conceived without seed and begotten without corruption, there came forth from a virgin the God who became man for our sake. To this the evangelist contributes his witness when he says, 'They came in haste and, when they had seen it, made known the saying that had been spoken to them, and all who heard wondered at what was spoken to them by the shepherds,' those whom 'the glory of the Lord had shone around' from heaven and also 'a multitude of the heavenly host praising God and saying, "Glory in the highest to God and on earth peace, goodwill among men."'²⁶ Together with them it is right that we too – on whose account in particular this was written, in sleepless zeal and solicitude 'keeping guard' over our own flocks, namely the congregations entrusted to us by the Lord in the 'night' of the present life, and coming together 'with the same mind and the same intent', as the great apostle says,²⁷ as to a spiritual Bethlehem (I mean this catholic and apostolic church of God, which he, 'the bread of life',²⁸ steadfastly inhabits) – should discern and inspect the word of the unimpeachable faith in him, so that, through its exact examination by reference to the sacred definitions and decrees of the apostles and the fathers that have been piously entrusted to us, the very glory of the Lord may shine around together with the host

²⁵ Lk 2:8.

²⁶ Lk 2:16–18, 9, 13–14.

²⁷ 1 Cor 1:10.

²⁸ Jn 6:35.





and hymnody of the heavenly angels, and that in our case as well the God of marvels may inspire ‘wonder’ in ‘all who hear’ of the total success (in the Lord) of our endeavours on behalf of piety.

Because, on hearing from those who pay him pure worship with gifts²⁹ (namely the correct doctrines of piety) that through true recognition and profession he was reigning divinely in all the holy churches and souls, some who are falsely named priests were troubled and, being vexed at the radiance of his light, endeavoured in our own age, or that of our predecessors, to abolish the most divine acknowledgement of him through novel concoctions of speech. As a result, pretending deceitfully to worship him and falsifying the scriptural and patristic testimonies about him, they misinterpreted them, twisting them into heretical false belief. Who are these people? It is right to identify them explicitly, for they are known to you, my beloved, and also [12] extremely familiar to virtually all the inhabitants of the whole world, for they have not perpetrated this ‘in secret nor in a dark place in the land’, as the blessed Isaiah says.³⁰ Would that they had kept this evil in secret for themselves alone, and had not proclaimed it in writing, in public and in the churches, for the detriment of many and the overturning of the unimpeachable faith! I am referring to Cyrus who was bishop of the church of Alexandria, Sergius who presided over the church of Byzantium, and those who followed him in succession, Pyrrhus and Paul, in competing with one another in this matter.

The first of them, namely Cyrus, eighteen years ago in the city of Alexander defined one operation in Christ, of his Godhead and manhood, in the same way as those heretics the Acephali, and decreed it by composing chapters, nine in number, that he proclaimed to them from the pulpit together with an anathema against those who did not share his beliefs.³¹ Sergius, in his letter written to this Cyrus, likewise accepted the same one operation and, contrary to reason, joined him in sanctioning it.³² And not only this, but some years after Cyrus’ innovation, that is, in the recently elapsed twelfth indiction,³³ he himself composed an heretical *Ekthesis* of

29 Cp. Mt 2:11. ‘Him’ here is Christ.

30 Is 45:19.

31 Cyrus of Alexandria issued his *Plerophoria* of nine chapters or anathemas in 633, of which the complete text comes in the Acts of Constantinople III (Session XIII) and the seventh, asserting ‘one theandric operation’, was read out at Session III of the Lateran Synod, p. 212 below.

32 Cp. Sergius’ Second Letter to Cyrus, pp. 213–16 below.

33 September 638 to August 639.





faith, in the name of the then emperor Heraclius, and like the most impious Apollinarius defined in it that our Saviour has one will and operation, by asserting mindlessly that will follows operation.³⁴ For it is clear that, if it [one operation] at all events follows its consequent, namely one will, he also professes the antecedent, I refer to the one operation confirmed by him in writing;³⁵ and it is manifest that in this they reject the concordant teaching of the fathers, defined inviolably, that things with one operation have one nature and that will corresponds to essence.³⁶ For so Saint Basil, writing against Eunomius, says: ‘Those who have one operation have also one essence.’³⁷ And again he writes to Saint Amphilochius, ‘He who has seen me has seen the Father, not the figure nor the form (for the divine nature is free of composition) but the goodness of the will, which, corresponding to the essence, is perceived to be alike and equal, or rather identical, in the Father and the Son.’³⁸ The most wise Cyril writes in his *Thesaura*, ‘For things that have the same operation are always wont to be of the same essence as well, and in their case difference of nature is wholly incredible.’³⁹ In his dialogue with Hermias⁴⁰ he says again, ‘It would be bizarre and ignorant to suppose that the Father is the begetter either involuntarily or voluntarily, but rather he is so by nature and essence; for he is not involuntarily that which he is naturally, since he possesses by nature the will to be what he is.’⁴¹

[14] Therefore they laid down that in the case of the divine essence and nature will and operation are by nature divine and that in the case of the human they are obviously human, with the result that they will not on

34 Cp. *Ekthesis* (p. 229 below), ‘Likewise the phrase “two operations” scandalizes many ... because there follows from it an assertion of two wills.’ Yet the *Ekthesis* is equally critical of the assertion of one operation in Christ.

35 The meaning is that if Sergius allows the argument from operation to will, he must also allow the argument from will to operation, and therefore his assertion of one will implies one operation, even if talk of either ‘two operations’ or ‘one operation’ was forbidden in the *Ekthesis*.

36 Cp. two florilegia in Session V, ‘On the natural operations’ and ‘On the natural wills’ (pp. 306–16), intended to demonstrate that one operation or one will in Christ would imply one essence or nature, and is therefore contrary to the Chalcedonian Definition of two natures in Christ. The following quotations are all taken from these florilegia.

37 Ps.-Basil, *Contra Eunomium* IV, PG 29. 676A, cited below, p. 309, §9.

38 Basil, *De spiritu sancto* 8.21, SC 17 bis, p. 318, 105AB, cited below, p. 314, §1.

39 Cyril, *Thesaurus* 32, PG 75. 517D, cited below, p. 313, §30.

40 Cyril, *Dialogues on the Trinity* 2, SC 231, p. 340, (456) 43–8.

41 Cyril, *Dialogues on the Trinity* 2, PG 75. 780AB, cited below, pp. 315–16, §10. It is cited here to reinforce the principle that will corresponds to nature and must therefore be dual in Christ.





the basis of this, namely of one will and one operation, transmit profession of likewise one nature of Godhead and manhood in Christ, in agreement with the heretics who have fallen into the error of fusion, but instead piously proclaim to us each of his natures by reference to each of his wills and operations. For if where the operation is one by nature they teach that the nature also is one, it is clear that where the natures are different they teach that the operations of the essences are different, since difference of nature implies difference of natural operation. Just as that which is the same in nature properly possesses identity {of operation},⁴² so for this reason they held that the divine and uncreated nature and operation are one, as also is the will in the case of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit of the holy, consubstantial and adorable Trinity, while correspondingly they proclaimed two natures and operations, as also wills, I mean the divine and human or uncreated and created (since it is impossible for them to be the same in nature), in the case of God the Word, one of the Holy Trinity, who became incarnate for our sake in unconfused and inseparable unity. This is clearly taught to us by the blessed Leo, who presided over our apostolic church, who in his second letter to the emperor Leo gives the following exposition of the wills of the same: 'In respect of the form of God he and the Father are one, but in respect of the form of the servant he did not come to do his own will but the will of him who sent him';⁴³ in respect of the form of God, as the Father has life in himself, so he has given the Son to have life in himself, but in respect of the form of the servant his soul is sorrowful unto death.⁴⁴ **[15–17]**⁴⁵ {That, in accordance with the natures, the one and the same Christ God has two wills he explicitly indicates to us by speaking of the will of 'the form of the servant', which is his human will, and by speaking also of 'the will of him who sent him', which is divine by nature.}

{The aforesaid father, writing to Flavian of blessed memory about the operations of the same our Saviour in his Tome, says, 'For each form in communion with the other operates what is proper to it, the Word

42 'Of operation' is in the Latin but missing in the Greek.

43 Contrast Gregory Nazianzen's interpretation of the passage referred to (Jn 6:38), discussed below, pp. 297–8: Gregory understood Christ's words not to affirm but to deny the possession of a second will.

44 Leo, Second Tome (= *ep.* 165), ACO II. 4, p. 117, 25–9, citing Phil 2:6–7, Jn 10:39, 6:38, 5:26, Mt 26:38.

45 The following two sections (which we bracket) survive only in the Latin version. Their omission in the Greek was probably accidental.





performing what is the Word's, and the flesh accomplishing what is of the flesh; and while one of these shines with miracles, the other succumbs to injuries.⁴⁶ The Tome was defined as a 'pillar' of the orthodox faith by the holy council of Chalcedon, that is to say the choir of all the saints, because what one council of holy fathers is seen to decree, all the councils and absolutely all the fathers are recognized as confirming, through agreeing with one another successively in indissoluble accord in one and the same expression of the faith. If, therefore, as the aforesaid father says, the same [person] naturally and voluntarily 'performs what is proper' to each nature from which and in which he is acknowledged to exist inseparably,⁴⁷ the same without doubt possessed the natural will and operation of each. For if he had not done so, neither did the nature of each 'operate what is proper to it', because whatever lacks will and operation will neither operate nor wills anything at all by nature, since it is agreed that one who wills is able to will by means of the will and that one who operates is able to operate by means of his naturally effective operation, just as the one who sees is able to see by means of sight and the one who hears to hear by means of hearing according to essence. For this reason he, God the Word, who became incarnate for our sake, by his divine and uncreated will and operation voluntarily operated according to nature what was proper to his Godhead and paternal nature, namely the miracles, which is why we have his testimony, 'As the Father raises the dead and gives them life, so too the Son gives life to whom he wills.'⁴⁸ And again in his human (namely his created) will and operation he endured willingly for us what was proper to his human nature, namely the salvific sufferings, because on our account and by human volition he who as God surpasses nature took on for our salvation hunger, thirst,

46 This citation is a retroversion from the Greek translation of the Tome (ACO II. 1, pp. 14,27–15,1), though with an eye on the original Latin (ACO II. 2, p. 28, 12–14). The one significant difference from Leo's own wording is the replacement of *agit enim utraque forma* by *operatur enim utraque forma*, which is surely to be attributed not to inadvertence but to a desire to make Leo's statement, in the Latin as in the Greek, a direct assertion of two 'operations' in Christ. The same alteration occurs in virtually all citations of this passage in the Latin Acts.

47 Note the rewording of Pope Leo's statement so as to make clear that the two operations did not involve two agents (as the non-Chalcedonians understood him to be saying) but were simply faculties possessed by one and the same person. Leo's assertion that each nature had its own operation was simply an application of the standard philosophical principle, going back to Aristotle, that every nature has its own 'movement'; cp. Aristotle, *Physics* 192b21, 'Nature is an origin and cause of being moved.'

48 Jn 5:21.





fatigue, sorrow and fear, and after all these the experience of death. And this is attested about him} [16] also by the evangelist: 'Entering a house, he wished no one to recognize him, but he could not be hid,⁴⁹ and again, 'Departing from there, they journeyed through Galilee, and he did not wish anyone to know it,'⁵⁰ and, 'On the morrow he wished to depart to Galilee,'⁵¹ and, 'They gave him wine mixed with gall and, having tasted it, he did not wish to drink it.'⁵² In a word, whatever was proper to the nature that he had taken from us apart from sin alone (even if there were things proper to each form or nature) proceeded, as the teacher says, in communion with the other in inseparable union. For in this way he performed the divine things bodily, since they were produced by means of his all-holy flesh with its intellectual soul,⁵³ and the human things divinely, since it was with power that blamelessly for our sake he took on the experience of these things; for 'he did not commit sin nor was deceit found in his mouth', as the sacred saying testifies.⁵⁴

Consequently, being refuted by this orthodox statement of the blessed pope Leo and therefore being eager to repudiate it openly, or rather all the holy fathers and the holy council at Chalcedon (to which belongs, as I have said, whatever was expressly approved by it),⁵⁵ Cyrus, as has already been said, compiled his Nine Chapters, while Sergius composed the lawless *Ekthesis*, which he published by posting it on the doors of his church, and not only this, but together with some bishops he had beguiled confirmed it in writing by a corresponding decree.⁵⁶ They did not respect the sentence justly imposed on those who innovate against the unimpeachable faith in the venerable definition of the same holy council at Chalcedon,⁵⁷ against

49 Mk 7:24. This and the three New Testament passages that follow immediately are all cited in a group by Maximus the Confessor, *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91. 321A–C), where likewise they serve as evidence for a distinct human will in Christ.

50 Mk 9:30.

51 Jn 1:43.

52 Mt 27:34.

53 Maximus insisted that in his miracles Christ used not only his divine power and will and his human body (when healing by touch) but also his (human) rational will; see PG 91. 317A–320A.

54 1 Pt 2:22 = Isa 53:5.

55 That is, the Tome, formally commended in the Chalcedonian Definition.

56 Extracts from the Acts of the synod at Constantinople that confirmed the *Ekthesis* in 638 are read out at Session III, pp. 231–2 below, after the *Ekthesis* itself, pp. 226–30.

57 See the final paragraph of the Chalcedonian Definition (Price and Gaddis (2005) II, 204–5), which forbids the use of any creeds apart from the Nicene. Evidently this did not exclude the production of new dogmatic decrees to clarify the faith.





which, indeed, the whole of their struggle and campaign was directed; for it was out of a wish to rescind it that in their own writings they devised against the catholic church a concoction of heretical doctrines. So much for Cyrus and Sergius.

Sergius' successors, Pyrrhus and Paul, advanced by their own folly the sowing of wickedness (as it were) which they had inherited from them. The former, namely Pyrrhus, having deceptively seduced again many of the bishops by intimidation and flattery, confirmed the impiety by means of minuted transactions and the personal signatures of those men whom he compelled [to sign], after 'raising up against the knowledge of God'⁵⁸ his own [18] heresy.⁵⁹ It was out of his former shame for this, since evil is blameworthy as subject to condemnation, that he hastened, coming here for this alone, to correct his error and present a document with his own signature to our apostolic see, condemning in this document everything whatever that had been written and transacted by him and his predecessors against the unimpeachable faith of us Christians. But after doing this, he later like an unclean dog returned to his own vomit of impiety,⁶⁰ incurring the canonical penalty as the just retribution for his apostasy.

Then Paul, wishing to surpass his predecessors in this respect, not only in writing by sending a letter to our see bound himself as well to this perverse heresy,⁶¹ but now in his audacity was led into written rebuttals of the orthodox doctrines of the church, taking a stand in opposition to the definitions of the fathers; in consequence he too incurred condign condemnation on apostolic authority. In addition to this he hastened, for the revealing of his own heresy, to imitate Sergius in practising deception and induce the most pious emperor to issue a *Typos* against the faith.⁶² In this *Typos* he employed the assertions of unspeakable heretics to reject all the statements of the holy fathers; he decreed that neither one nor two wills and operations are to be recognized in Christ God, with the result that henceforth Christ is to be described as entirely without will or operation, that is, without essence or existence. For as the sacred Dionysius says,

58 2 Cor 10:5.

59 Extracts from the Acts of the synod at Constantinople under Pyrrhus that reconfirmed the *Ekthesis* are read out at Session III, pp. 233–4 below.

60 Cf. 2 Pt 2:22.

61 Latin: 'the irrational heresy of the afore-mentioned *Ekthesis*'. The reference is to Paul's letter of 646 to Pope Theodore, read out in Session IV, pp. 254–60 below.

62 We have progressed from the events of 646 to those of 648, when the *Typos* (pp. 262–3 below) was issued.





‘That which has no power neither exists nor is anything, nor does it have any place at all,’⁶³ since every nature is only acknowledged to exist, as subsistent in true existence, in virtue of the natural and essential power that pertains to it and which also defines its nature.

In consequence, in defending this nonsense of his, he dared to commit lawlessly what other heretics had never dared to do; for overturning the altar of our apostolic see that is piously erected in our holy chapel in the Placidia Palace, he prevented our *apocrisarii* from offering to God the bloodless and spiritual sacrifice or sacred rite and from partaking of his divine and life-giving mysteries. It is they in particular, on account of the warning and admonishment they gave him at the injunction of apostolic authority because of this heresy, whom he subjected to persecution, together with other orthodox men and God-beloved priests, imprisoning these, deporting those, and maltreating others.⁶⁴

But why extend this account by narrating what is wholly familiar to everyone, namely everything (as I have said) that has been publicly perpetrated by him and those before him for so many years against the pious men and doctrines? As a result they caused alarm to almost the whole world, and a great number of the orthodox in various places felt compelled to present pleas or charges against them to our apostolic see, sometimes in writing in prayers and petitions, sometimes by personal visits and appeals, urging the excision by apostolic authority of so great and so dire an evil, [20] lest the infection of their pernicious *Ekthesis* should spread through the whole body of the catholic church. In consequence the high priests of blessed memory who preceded us did not overlook the petitions presented by the pious in written form or by word of mouth, and did not cease writing with forethought at various times to the men afore-mentioned, sometimes exhorting them and sometimes threatening them with the canons, and then, as I have said, through the *apocrisarii* or apostolic men whom they sent principally for this purpose adjuring and charging them face to face to correct their innovation and return to the orthodox faith of the catholic church. But neither exhortations nor threats were able to move them, but, as the Lord said about the incorrigible, ‘We piped to you and you did not dance, we wailed and you did not mourn’,⁶⁵ ‘for their heart has been hardened,’ as

63 Ps.-Dionysius, *The Divine Names* 8.5, in *Corpus Dionysiacum* I, p. 203, 2–4.

64 The account given here of the harassment of the pope’s agents and allies in Constantinople reappears verbatim in the *Liber pontificalis* 76.2, trans. Davis (2000) 70–1.

65 Mt 11:17.





it is written,⁶⁶ ‘and they heard heavily with their ears and closed their eyes, lest they should see with their eyes and hear with their ears and understand in their heart and turn and be healed’ by receiving the message of salvation.

In consequence, because of their unrepentant heart and the souls seduced by them and perishing, and also because of the complaints addressed in writing to our apostolic see on this account by those accusing them (as has been mentioned), and because I dread the threat that weighs on those who do the Lord’s work negligently, I too, on account of the present matter, have of necessity exhorted and convened in the name of the Lord all of you who are by grace his priests, so that we may all in common, with the Lord himself looking down and judging ourselves and all our affairs, examine the aforesaid men and their innovation in doctrine, especially since we have an apostolic injunction to ‘attend to yourselves and to the flock in which the Holy Spirit has appointed you overseers, to shepherd the church of God, which he acquired through his own blood,’⁶⁷ and again to ‘look out for the wolves, look out for the workers of iniquity,’⁶⁸ those who perform and ‘utter perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them,’⁶⁹ ‘lest a root of bitterness springing up’⁷⁰ harm the faith through the negligence of those appointed by him to root out evil and plant excellence, namely us priests. Therefore, because each one of us has an account to render without shrinking to him who ‘is going to judge the world in righteousness’⁷¹ (for ‘if he shrinks,’ he says, ‘my soul is not well-pleased with him’)⁷² – and especially since all of us who for this reason have assembled and are in session here recognize with precision the magnitude of their nonsense both from the persons who have accused them in writing and from their own writings against the unimpeachable faith – let each of us carry into effect whatever under divine inspiration is seen to be for the glory of God who spurs him on. He is to give priority to the fear of God in all that he thinks and speaks about this matter for the protection and support of the catholic church and the orthodox faith, meaning the salvation of our souls, for this, as is manifest to all of us, is the fruit of a pure confession of our Lord and God Jesus Christ.

66 Mt 13:15.

67 Acts 20:28.

68 Phil 3:2.

69 Acts 20:30.

70 Heb 12:15.

71 Acts 17:31.

72 Heb 10:38, citing Hab 2:4.





[22] Maurus, the most devout bishop of Cesena, and Deusdedit, a presbyter of Ravenna, came forward and said through one of them, Maurus bishop of Cesena:

We inform your apostolic holiness that what you have now so wisely uttered has made clear to all, and unknown to none of the pious, what has been lawlessly perpetrated for so many years against the unimpeachable faith of us Christians by Cyrus and Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul, who have for this reason been rightly accused before your chief and apostolic see by those incited against them by godly zeal. In consequence that devotee of your beatitude Maurus the most God-beloved bishop of Ravenna, having accurately learnt this about them from his *apocrisarii*, hastened to send us to your honoured feet, on account of his own inability at present to come according to your instructions because of certain compelling needs that prevent him, with the result that we ourselves must fill his place in all the canonical proceedings of the holy synod here present in defence of the orthodox faith. Accordingly we bear in our hands a letter on this matter that he has signed, in which on his own behalf he has explicitly confirmed our persons as regards the proceedings and given the reason why he himself was unable to come, despite his great zeal and eagerness over the matter. But if it is pleasing to your beatitude, we request that this letter be read before all others to the holy synod here present and inserted in the acts.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

In accordance with the request of Maurus bishop of Cesena and Deusdedit presbyter of Ravenna, let the signed letter they have brought from Maurus the most devout bishop of Ravenna be received from them and read to the holy synod here present.

Paschalis, regional notary⁷³ of the apostolic see, received and read it.⁷⁴

[22–3] *The heading*.⁷⁵ To the holy and deservedly⁷⁶ most blessed lord and

⁷³ There were seven 'regional notaries' in the Roman chancery, corresponding to the seven regions of the city.

⁷⁴ We translate the Latin version, which is the primary text, Riedinger (1981) 198.

⁷⁵ 'The heading' and 'the text' occur regularly in the Greek Acts when a document is presented, but are omitted in the Latin version.

⁷⁶ Note, as an indication that this Latin heading is the original one, the inclusion of the





apostolic and universal⁷⁷ pontiff throughout the world, Pope Martin, from Bishop Maurus, a servant of the servants of God and bishop.⁷⁸

The text. Sole and unique for all is the remedy vouchsafed by our Redeemer, God and Lord Jesus Christ for the salvation of our souls – that we should adhere without doubting to what we have learnt from the preaching of the apostles and the teaching of the fathers.

[25] I was accordingly admonished by the injunctions of your apostolicity that because of what has been composed against their teaching I ought to repair to the holy and apostolic church and your presence, and that the instruction of the fathers on these matters ought to be decreed [by me] together with the other bishops. This I was most ready to do, but because I was detained by the army and people of this city and also of the Pentapolis⁷⁹ because of the unpredictable incursions of the tribes and the absence of the most excellent exarch,⁸⁰ I have been compelled to proceed to the apology I am now offering. It is with deep sorrow that, as I make this apology, I entreat your apostolic office to deign to accept me not as absent but as present and eager; for in respect of what will be mooted and is proposed concerning⁸¹ the decrees of the orthodox fathers [I profess] that my beliefs do not differ from what is held by your holy apostolic teaching and the orthodox church. And in rejecting and repelling every innovation, not only do I spurn the *Ekthesis* that was defended by Pyrrhus, former bishop of Constantinople, because indeed it was removed from the edifice of the church of Constantinople as heretical,⁸² but whatever recently has been composed in any way in its

word ‘deservedly’ (*meritis*), which never appears in this phrase when it is translated from the Greek, which regularly omits it.

77 The Greek translates this as ‘ecumenical’, a title that had been fiercely attacked by Pope Gregory the Great as improper for any hierarch to adopt, the pope included. See Markus (1997) 91–4.

78 After this heading the Greek version has the words ‘Chapter Three’. Chapter-numbering continues throughout the Acts; it is to be attributed to some later stage of editing, perhaps at the same time as the addition of a summary at the beginning of each session.

79 The region south of Ravenna along the Adriatic coast, including the five cities of Rimini, Pesaro, Fano, Sinigaglia and Ancona.

80 The exarch of Ravenna had charge of both civil and military affairs throughout Italy.

81 The use here of *contra* can only have arisen from translation from Greek, since *κατά* + genitive was regularly translated by *contra* in sixth- and seventh-century texts, even when (as here) it means ‘concerning’ rather than ‘against’ (for another example in these acts see ACO² I, p. 355, 15). This mistake suggests that the whole clause was added when the letter was being translated into Greek.

82 When the emperor Heraclius died in 641, his immediate and short-lived successor Constantine III wrote to Rome promising to have the *Ekthesis* removed from its display in





defence I neither approve nor accept but reject with an anathema. But I profess two operations and two wills and that the Lord Jesus Christ is God and man, conceived through the Holy Spirit in the womb of the Virgin and born {from her without seed}⁸³ in two natures, true God and man in one person, performing the operations of both Godhead and manhood. I profess that I hold nothing apart from what we find to have been taught by the four universal synods (and I accept the fifth under Justinian of pious memory),⁸⁴ and that I confess with total constancy that faith alone which was established by the fathers, in which they preached [Christ,] true God and true man, 'complete in what is his and complete in what is ours'.⁸⁵ For this reason, I have not omitted to send this expression of my apology by my fellow servants Bishop Maurus of Cesena and Deusdedit the presbyter, and to send them as my representatives, in order [to assure you] that whatever they decree against the *Ekthesis*⁸⁶ and other writings composed recently in its defence will most indubitably be upheld by me.

The subscription: Pray for me, holy and deservedly most blessed lord, apostolic pope throughout the world.

[24]⁸⁷ Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

The letter that has been read from Maurus the most devout bishop of Ravenna agrees with the apostolic doctrines and accordingly contains, together with a confirmation of the correct profession of the holy fathers, an annulment and condemnation of every heresy. Let it therefore, if the holy synod here present is in agreement, be inserted in our proceedings.

[26] Maximus the most God-beloved bishop of Aquileia⁸⁸ said:

Since the letter of Maurus the most devout bishop of Ravenna is on

Hagia Sophia, but Pope Theodore complained later that this had not been done (Bréhier and Aigrain (1938) 144).

83 Supplied from the Greek text.

84 It is typical of western attitudes to the Fifth Ecumenical Council of 553 that it was accepted but not put on a par with the four earlier councils. See Price (2009) II, 99–101.

85 From Leo's Tome, Price and Gaddis (2005) II, 18.

86 The Latin is 'adversum Ectheseos'. The use of the genitive betrays translation from the Greek (κατὰ τῆς εἰρημένης Ἐκθέσεως). This suggests that the whole clause was added when the Greek version of the letter was being produced.

87 We here return to the Greek text.

88 The bishops of Aquileia in communion with Rome resided at Grado on the Adriatic from the time of the Lombard invasion (568).





your instructions to be inserted in our faithful minutes, and since by means of it he makes known that his own judgement is in accord with the holy synod here present, as regards its proceedings in defence of the orthodox faith, I wish to state frankly that everyone who explicitly denies the difference between the natural wills and operations of the one and the same Christ also denies the difference between his natures, from which and in which he exists. For it is not possible for the one and the same our Lord and God Jesus Christ, being both uncreated and created by nature, not to preserve in union the natural property in volition and operation of each of the natures from which he is. For whoever does not hold this belief rejects the holy council at Chalcedon and spurns all the holy fathers equally, since in its definition it plainly teaches simply this, that the difference between Christ's two natures is not abolished after the union, while there is ceaselessly preserved the natural property of each nature, apart from sin alone.⁸⁹ If, therefore, it is authoritatively defined that, in consequence of the preservation of the natural property of the natures from which he is, the difference between the natures is not destroyed, and since the property of Christ's divine nature is that he wills divinely and performs what is divine, while the property, again, of his human nature is that the same wills humanly and performs what is human, for a true confirmation that he is by nature both God and man, it is manifest that such a one rejects the specific property of each nature and therefore the difference between the natures after the union, since he is rejecting the difference between Christ's natural wills and operations, with the result that the holy council at Chalcedon and, as has already been said, all the approved fathers of the catholic church are being rejected.

Because of this it is necessary, according to your most wise exhortation, or rather according to the most divine precept of the Lord himself, for us who have been appointed to exercise oversight of his household, namely the catholic church, to stay awake, lest any of his sacred treasures, namely the doctrines of the apostles and fathers about him, be plundered by thieves assailing in secret and finding us asleep as the result of a remiss and careless observance of his holy commandments. Therefore, if it is pleasing to your beatitude, I urge that, through one or two at the most of the persons who have accused them (Cyrus and Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul), lest we make the proceedings tedious by what is clearly acknowledged, the case concerning them be set out for us in sequence, and then in addition from

89 See the Chalcedonian Definition, in Price and Gaddis (2005) II, 204.





their own writings against the faith, which manifestly constitute a clear indictment against them even without accusers. Since they are accused by their own writings, with which they have alarmed the world, an accusation on other grounds is acknowledged to be somewhat superfluous; for the Lord says, 'From your mouth shall I judge you,'⁹⁰ and, 'By your words you will justified, and by your words you will be condemned.'⁹¹ That we do not need many accusers, even if [28] they happen to exist, when the censure they make is obvious, is something we have clearly learnt from the holy councils that preceded us. For in the case of both the heretics – I mean the impious Nestorius and Eutyches, as also Dioscorus – only one accuser is recorded, the blessed⁹² Eusebius bishop of Dorylaeum; of the ill-named Theodore and Origen at the holy fifth council there was no accuser, and their writings on their own were sufficient for their accusation and censure. And so, while preserving the good order of our proceedings, let us proceed, if it seems good, after one or a second person from those who accuse them, to the examination, with all precision, of their writings.'

Deusdedit the most God-beloved bishop of Cagliari said:

Your beatitude, spurred on by apostolic zeal, has spurred us all to assemble together to protect the catholic church, which is being assailed by those who oppose the word of the faith; for you are enduring, most holy one, the same as the blessed Paul when he said, 'Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is made to fall, and I am not on fire?',⁹³ and you do not wish any of the rational sheep entrusted to you by God to become a prey to wild beasts. Therefore I too propose, for the vindication of the definitions and doctrines of the fathers and councils, that we scrutinize the nonsense of Cyrus and Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul, first by means of some of the persons who have accused or now accuse them before your apostolic see, and then in sequence by means of what they wrote against our unimpeachable faith, so that the judgement made in their case may correspond to an examination of their writings.

All the holy bishops said:

We acknowledge that the correct doctrines of the church are in accord with what you have taught, most blessed one, and that the pious faith of

90 Lk 19:22.

91 Mt 12:37.

92 Meaning simply 'deceased'.

93 2 Cor 11:29.





THE FIRST SESSION

131

the holy fathers and councils is being subverted by those who teach as doctrine that the Godhead and manhood of Christ have a single will and operation. We request that the case of the accused, even though it is in no way unfamiliar to us, be nevertheless made known to us all, according to the due sequence of the proceedings, by the persons making the accusation, so that we may carry out a proper and reasoned examination of the matter, with the scrutiny being made yet more perfectly precise, as has already been said, by means of their writings against the faith.





THE SECOND SESSION

SUMMARY¹

[34] The Second Act publishes openly the written protests, namely complaints and appeals, of the God-beloved bishops, hegumens and monks who presented them to the apostolic see against the aforesaid heretics, while they urged their deposition by apostolic authority, all of them in harmony entreating that this be done, for the vindication and protection of the pious doctrines handed down to us from of old by the holy apostles and the approved fathers and councils of the catholic church.

INTRODUCTION

The second session of the synod took place on 8 October, three days after the first. It began with a short speech by Pope Martin, repeating the decision of the first session that in the trial of the patriarchs accused of heresy their accusers should first be heard, before the synod proceeded to an examination of their writings. There followed the reading before the assembled bishops of the following documents, all of them complaints against the monotheletes:

- (1) [pp. 142–9] from Bishop Stephen of Dora in Palestine, addressed to the synod,
- (2) [pp. 151–6] from a group of thirty-six eastern hegumens and monks currently resident in Rome, addressed to the synod,
- (3) [pp. 157–60] from Archbishop Sergius of Cyprus,² addressed to Pope Theodore and dated 29 May 643,

¹ Taken from the Greek Acts.

² That is, bishop of the metropolitan see of Constantia (= Salamis). A message from Theodore Spudaeus to Pope Martin when a prisoner at Constantinople in 653 refers to Sergius having suffered ‘shipwreck’ (PL 129. 587A), meaning that by this date he had deserted the dyothelete cause.





(4) [pp. 161–4] from the three primates of the African provinces of Byzacena, Numidia and Mauretania, addressed to Pope Theodore and dating to 646,³

(5) [pp. 166–9] from forty-two bishops of Byzacena, addressed to the emperor Constans II and datable to 646,⁴

(6) [pp. 178–80] from sixty-eight suffragan bishops of Proconsularis,⁵ addressed to Patriarch Paul of Constantinople and presumably also dating to 646,

(7) [pp. 182–6] from Bishop Victor of Carthage, addressed to Pope Theodore, informing him of his election to the see on 16 July 646.

Of these the first two (which were new documents) were presented to the synod by their authors in person, while the others were produced from the archives of the Roman see by the chief notary (p. 157).

The authors of the documents

What do these documents tell us of the geographical spread of opposition to the monothelite policy of Constantinople in the middle and late 640s? Rome could expect most support (outside Italy) from Africa, and this dossier duly concludes with four African appeals. Doubts have been expressed about their authenticity. Two of them (nos 4 and 7 above) contain citations or borrowings from papal letters contained in an early sixth-century Roman collection.⁶ In an article published in 1980 Riedinger suggested that this collection could have made its way to Africa and have been made use of by an African chancery, but thought it more likely that the first of these documents (the letter to Pope Theodore from three African primates) was drafted in Rome and then sent to Africa, where ‘well-informed men’ adapted it for the local situation – adding (presumably) the later part of the letter, which refers to specifically African developments. Riedinger concluded: ‘This would mean that the dyothelete faction of African

3 The notary who reads out this letter at this session (p. 161) dates it to the fourth indiction (September 645 to August 646). A date later rather than earlier in this indiction is suggested by the request that the pope forward an appeal from them to Paul of Constantinople, since a similar request in similar terms is made by Victor of Carthage in his letter of July 646.

4 It refers (p. 162) to Pyrrhus’ rejection of monothelitism in 645, which in 647 he reversed.

5 Not including their primate, the bishop of Carthage, doubtless because Victor had not yet been elected.

6 These borrowings from Popes Innocent I, Celestine I and Felix are detailed in our footnotes 119, 122 and 208.





bishops, apparently documented by these four letters, was in fact merely the echo of instructions that had been received from Rome.⁷ In 1984, in the preface to the ACO edition of the Lateran Acts, he summarised the same evidence and concluded that ‘with the greatest probability these letters were produced in Rome by the authors of the Greek-Latin text of the Lateran Acts’.⁸ Following Riedinger, Winkelmann in 2001 described these letters as ‘fictions’ and ‘falsifications’.⁹

At this point scepticism has surely got out of hand. The Lateran Acts, including these letters, were sent to Africa.¹⁰ How would the African bishops have reacted to forgeries issued in their name? What are we to make of the lists of African signatories attached to two of these documents (5 and 6 above), which are patently authentic? When are the forgeries supposed to have been made? There would have been little motive to concoct them until preparations were being made for the presentation of anti-monothelete appeals at the synod of 649; but the letter of the three African primates, which refers with respect to Pyrrhus (p. 162 below), must have been written before Pyrrhus reverted to monotheletism in 647.¹¹ It remains possible that all or some of these letters were drafted in Rome and then sent to Africa for approval and adoption by the African bishops. In view of the close contacts between Rome and Africa, intensified in this period by the movements to and fro of refugee monks from the East, the possible permutations are numerous, and it is vain to surmise where or by whom these documents were drafted.¹² The important question is whether their issuing by African bishops is evidence of a genuine enthusiasm for the dyothelete cause in Africa or of mere submissiveness to Roman prompting.

7 Riedinger (1980) 41–3.

8 ACO² I, xvii.

9 Winkelmann (2001) 118–19.

10 This is explicitly stated in a letter of Pope Martin to the Church of Carthage, PL 87. 148D.

11 Forgery in 646 is unlikely, since documents were not essential for Theodore’s campaign against Paul of Constantinople; his extant letter to Paul (PL 87. 75–82) does not cite documents or refer to Africa.

12 The extracts from Ambrose that appear in the florilegium that concludes the letter from the bishops of Proconsularis (pp. 172–3 below) may be compared to those in the first florilegium in Session V (see our footnotes). Both florilegia belong to the same milieu, but no firm conclusions can be drawn about the authorship of the African one. Note that here the Latin version is the primary one, while in the florilegium in Session V the Greek text is primary.





In fact, if we take these documents as they stand, the story they tell is of an African enthusiasm for the cause that was far from universal. The first of them had been sent to Pope Theodore in the name of the primates of Byzacena, Numidia and Mauretania, the see of Carthage (the metropolis of Proconsularis) being vacant. It refers to a plan to hold synods in all the African provinces, aborted by unspecified adverse circumstances, and mentions an appeal to Patriarch Paul of Constantinople which the primates ask Rome to forward to its addressee through the services of the papal *apocrisarii* at Constantinople. The second document is a plaint addressed to the emperor Constans by the primate of Byzacena and forty-one of his suffragans; since even under the Vandals we hear of 115 sees in Byzacena, this is not an impressive figure.¹³ The third document is an appeal addressed to Constans II from sixty-eight suffragan bishops of Proconsularis, meeting in synod; since there was at this juncture no primate of the province to require attendance (Victor, the author of the final document in this series, had not yet been elected), this is a very respectable figure. But there is nothing to suggest that comparable synods were held in the provinces of Numidia and Mauretania. The numerous eastern monks allied to Maximus the Confessor who had made their way to Africa as refugees are likely to have taken up residence in the two easterly provinces, while the impact of the debate held at Carthage in 645 between Maximus and Pyrrhus must have been muted by the fact that the then bishop of Carthage and primate of Africa (Fortunius or Fortunatus) supported the Byzantine government.¹⁴ In all, the four African documents read out at this session fell well short of proving that Rome's anti-monothelite crusade enjoyed general support in the region.¹⁵ If these documents were indeed 'falsifications', intended to create an impression that all Christian Africa was passionately involved on the Roman side, they would surely have told a more rousing and unequivocal story.

Who, meanwhile, were Rome's supporters in, or from, the East? A prominent position is assigned in this session to Bishop Stephen of Dora. His letter contains important information about Stephen himself. It relates

13 This figure is from the *Notitia provinciarum et civitatum Africae*, dating to 484 (MGH. AA 3/1, ed. K. Halm, Berlin 1878) 66–8.

14 The Acts of Constantinople III refer to a visit he paid to Constantinople when Paul was patriarch and the honourable reception he was accorded (ACO² II/2, 652).

15 Pope Martin, in his comments that accompany the reading of these letters at this session, tries to obscure this by referring to each of the letters as written by the African bishops in a body.





how Patriarch Sophronius of Jerusalem solemnly charged him with going to Rome to promote the cause of orthodoxy, and how Stephen fulfilled this charge 'as the first man in the jurisdiction of Jerusalem' – that is, claiming to be the patriarchal *locum tenens* after Sophronius' death. He calls his presence at the synod of 649 his third visit to Rome.¹⁶ He gives information of a rival *locum tenens* of the see of Jerusalem, the pro-Byzantine Sergius of Joppa, who had originally held this position after the Persian withdrawal from Jerusalem (in 630), presumably in the interregnum between the patriarchates of Modestus (died 631) and Sophronius (patriarch 634–8). The bishops consecrated by Sergius wrote to Paul of Constantinople to express their acceptance of the *Typos* of 648. Pope Theodore, when informed of this, appointed Stephen his representative in the Jerusalem patriarchate, with the particular task of achieving the repentance or, failing that, the deposition and replacement of the bishops who had been consecrated by Sergius and had subsequently subscribed to the *Typos*. Two letters of Pope Martin, dating to 31 October 649 (the final day of the synod), lament the failure of Stephen's mission and appoint John of Philadelphia (in the province of Arabia) to take his place, with responsibility for replacing monothelete bishops not only in Palestine but in Syria as well.¹⁷ Despite the strong stand against monoenergism taken by the formidable and respected Sophronius, and the links between Rome and Palestine, the monothelete cause appears to have predominated in Palestine; its continued strength after the Arab conquest shows it was in no way dependent on imperial support. There is nothing to suggest that Rome's intervention achieved anything.

Who were the eastern monks residing in Rome at the time of the synod and who, like Stephen, appeared in person at this session to present their appeal?¹⁸ The presumption is that they had in the main come from the East as refugees from the Persians and the Arabs at various dates between around 610 and the convocation of the synod. Their leaders were four hegumens (p. 150–1), of whom the first two named (John and Theodore) headed monasteries called after the famous sixth-century Palestinian monastic founder, St Sabas, and may be presumed to have come from

16 Stephen's claim that he was acting as the representative of 'almost all the God-loving bishops and Christ-loving congregations in the East' appears greatly to overstate his standing and influence. It is significant that he was unable to produce a document signed by the other bishops of Palestine.

17 Martin, *opp.* 5 and 9, PL 87. 154–64, 170–4. See pp. 394–5 below.

18 The following discussion follows Sansterre (1983) I, 9–31.





Palestine originally – though not directly to Rome, since we are told that Theodore's monastery was in Africa (p. 150) and the reference in the plaint to a time 'when we were residing in the land of Africa' (p. 152) is likely to refer to both of them. After the synod of 649 John's group remained in Rome, forming a celebrated community,¹⁹ while Theodore returned to Africa, taking the synodal acts to the Church of Carthage.²⁰ In contrast, the other two hegumens – Thalassius of the monastery 'of Renatus' and George of the monastery 'at Aquae Salviae' – headed communities already well established in Rome and may never have been to Africa.²¹ The Acts describe Thalassius' community as consisting of Armenians, which could mean Armenians from Palestine. George's community is described as made up of Cilician monks; close links between Cilician monasticism and that of Palestine is suggested by the prominence of Cilician monks and monasteries in the *Spiritual Meadow* by the Palestinian monk John Moschus.²² A further thirty-two monks appear in the list of signatories.²³ Three of them must be identical to 'the monks of the most sacred monastery of the holy Theodosius, John, Stephen and Leontius' who are said in a letter of Pope Martin's to have attended the synod;²⁴ this monastery was one of the greatest monasteries of Palestine, and had produced both John Moschus and Patriarch Sophronius. The same monks are likely to be those referred to in another letter as providing an escort for Stephen of Dora; after the synod they returned to Palestine as members of the delegation conveying copies of the synodal acts.²⁵

In all, these eastern monks were primarily, though not exclusively, from Palestine. Apart from the trio who returned to Palestine immediately after the synod, they appear to have been refugees now settled in Italy or Africa.

19 See Leclercq (1950).

20 Martin, Letter to the Church of Carthage (PL 87. 148D). According to Martin's instructions, Theodore was then, as papal *apocrisiarius*, to lead the delegation taking copies of the documents to Palestine (PL 87. 161A).

21 A distinction between 'those who have long resided here' (Rome) and 'those who have settled here recently' is made when these monks are first mentioned by the notary Theophylact (p. 48).

22 See Chadwick (1974) 56.

23 Sansterre (1983) I, 30 notes that, although this is not a complete tally of Greek monks in Rome at this date, the total number was probably not high: there had been no general exodus of monks from Palestine, and only some of the refugees will have made their way to Rome.

24 Martin, Letter to John of Philadelphia (PL 87. 161A).

25 Ibid., and Martin, Letter to George of the monastery of St Theodosius (PL 87. 168B).





Towards the bottom of the list occur the names 'Maximus, monk' and 'Anastasius, monk', who are presumed to be Maximus the Confessor and his constant companion and assistant Anastasius (this is the sole mention of Maximus in the Acts). This suggests that it was precisely this group of Greek monks to whom had been entrusted the composition of the synodal acts.²⁶

Content and significance

The importance of these documents for the synod of 649 lay in part in the declarations they all contain of a recognition of the supreme authority of the Roman see; on this theme the three letters from eastern bishops and monks are no less fervent and explicit than the letters from Africa. As for their contribution to the doctrinal debate, Stephen of Dora was a close ally of both Pope Martin and Maximus the Confessor; not surprisingly, his letter anticipates the main arguments to be developed at the synod – the dyothelete implications of the Chalcedonian Definition and the 'incoherence' of the *Typos*. The same points are made in the letter from the hegumens and monks, whose close similarity to the synodal acts in both content and expression gives support to the notion that these monks were involved in the composition of the Acts. The African documents are different in content and tone, and vary among themselves. The first two (from the three primates and from Byzacena) make the right orthodox noises but prudently steer clear of doctrinal details. The other two, both from Proconsularis, where Maximus had debated the issues with Pyrrhus, are more ambitious. The letter from the sixty-eight suffragans defines dyotheletism briefly but precisely and concludes with a florilegium of quotations from Ambrose and Augustine, some of which were to reappear in the florilegia included in the acts of the final session of 649. The last of these letters, from Victor of Carthage, though lacking a florilegium, is similar in content and tone.

The most interesting point about the African letters, however, is a shift in the context in which they were placed and therefore in the meaning ascribed to them. They date to 646, to the time when Pope Theodore was supporting a repentant Pyrrhus and challenging the authority and orthodoxy of Patriarch Paul of Constantinople. He must have sought support from Africa, and these letters were the fruit (a somewhat disappointing one, as we have argued). The purpose of the letters is to apply pressure on Paul

²⁶ See p. 62 above.





(whether directly or via pope and emperor) to induce him to withdraw his support for the monothelete *Ekthesis* composed by his predecessor Sergius in 638. They do not reflect the intensification of the conflict in the course of 646, which led Pope Theodore to declare Paul deposed and excommunicate. But what was the significance of these letters for the Lateran Synod of 649? In this second session of the synod Pope Martin (or sometimes another bishop) provides a commentary on each of them as they are read out. Particularly revealing is his speech at the end of the session, when he commends Victor of Carthage for ‘not treating him [Paul] as excommunicate but calling him “fellow bishop” until such time as he may learn of the judgement passed on him by our apostolic authority’ (p. 186). He proceeds to interpret Victor’s letter (and by implication all the African letters) as complaints addressed to the synod, demanding condemnation of the monothelete leaders and their doctrines. Martin ignores the original context of 646 and the fact that his predecessor had excommunicated Paul and condemned his doctrine a few years previously; instead, he treats these letters as appeals to his own synod of 649. The synod claimed to be responding to appeals from the whole Christian world, which left it no choice but to proceed to action. But the only demands for action being made in 649 were from Stephen of Dora, Maximus the Confessor, and the Greek monks in their entourage. Most of the Christians in the East will have seen the synod as an attempt to unsettle a church at peace.

TEXT

[31]²⁷ In the name of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the ninth year of the reign of lord Constantine the most pious Augustus, eight days before the Ides of October in the eighth indiction,²⁸ there presided the holy and most blessed Martin, pope of the holy apostolic see of the city of Rome, with the sacrosanct and venerable gospels lying displayed, in the church of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ that is called the Constantinian, and there were also seated to conduct the hearing equally with him the venerable men (2) Maximus the most holy bishop of Aquileia, (3) Deusdedit the most holy bishop of Cagliari, (4) Maurus bishop of

27 This introduction and the following attendance list come only in the Latin version. The list is identical to those of the other sessions and derives from the subscription list to the synodal canons (pp. 384–7 below).

28 8 October 649.





Cesena and the presbyter Deusdedit, the representatives of Maurus the most holy bishop of the church of Ravenna, (5) Sergius bishop of Tempsa, (6) Reparatus bishop of Manturia, (7) Epiphanius bishop of Albanum, (8) Benedict bishop of Ajaccio, (9) Julian bishop of Horta, (10) Papinius bishop of Vibo, (11) Maximus bishop of Pisaurum, (12) Lucian bishop of Leontium, (13) Viator bishop of Ortona, (14) Bonitus bishop of Formiae, (15) Majorianus bishop of Palestrina, (16) Germanus bishop of Numana, (17) Laurence bishop of Perusium, (18) Carosus bishop of Falerii, (19) Marcianus bishop of Mevania, (20) Barbatus bishop of Sutrium, (21) Calumniosus bishop of Halaesa, (22) Peregrinus bishop of Messina, (23) Romanus bishop of Cerillae, (24) Crescentius bishop of Locri, (25) Felix bishop of Agrigentum, (26) Marcellinus bishop of Clusium, (27) Geminianus bishop of Volaterrae, (28) Marinianus bishop of Populonia, (29) Luminosus bishop of Tifernum Tiberinum, (30) Potentinus bishop of Velitrae, (31) Maurus bishop of Tuscana, (32) Martin bishop of Gabii, (33) Adeodatus bishop of Spoleto, (34) John bishop of Paestum, (35) Gaudiosus bishop of Reate, (36) [33] Laurence bishop of Tauriana, (37) John bishop of Tropeia, (38) Luminosus bishop of Salernum, (39) Sabbatius bishop of Buxentum, (40) John bishop of Tarentum, (41) Rufinus bishop of Sipontum, (42) Adeodatus bishop of Ameria, (43) Gaudiosus bishop of Capua, (44) Bonitus bishop of Ferentia, (45) Maurus bishop of Senegallica, (46) Maurosus bishop of Ancona, (47) Bonus bishop of Ficuciae, (48) Fortunatus bishop of Auximum, (49) Thomas bishop of Lunae, (50) Bonitus bishop of Ferentum Polymartium, (51) Maximus bishop of Trecalae, (52) Paschalis bishop of Blanda [Julia], (53) Luminosus bishop of the Marsi, (54) Gloriosus bishop of Camerinum, (55) Decoratus bishop of Tibur, (56) Amabilis bishop of Ostia, (57) Albinus bishop of Portus, (58) Palumbus bishop of Fundi, (59) Theodosius bishop of Croton, (60) Scholasticus bishop of Fanum, (61) Helias bishop of Lilybaeum, (62) Aquilinus bishop of Assisium, (63) Eusebius bishop of Atella, (64) Martin bishop of Centumcellae, (65) Juventinus bishop of Stabiae, (66) Maurus bishop of Senae, (67) Laetus bishop of Luca, (68) Theodore bishop of Rosellae, (69) Andrew bishop of Ydruntum, (70) Justus bishop of Tauromenium, (71) Felix bishop of Panormus, (72) Laurence bishop of Tuder, (73) John bishop of Carinae, (74) Albinus bishop of Signia, (75) Augustine bishop of Squillacium, (76) John bishop of Regium, (77) Barbatus bishop of Cumae, (78) Felix bishop of Terracina, (79) [35] Oportunus bishop of Anagnina, (80) Firminus bishop of Blera, (81) Jovian bishop of Firmum, (82) Anastasius bishop of Narnia, (83) Theodore





bishop of Tyndaris, (84) Sapienius bishop of Nomentum, (85) Maximus bishop of Misenum, (86) Gratosus bishop of Nepet, (87) Leontius bishop of Naples, (88) Paschalis bishop of Thermae [Himeriae], (89) Oportunus bishop of Pisae, (90) Donatus bishop of Mariana, (91) Bonosus bishop of Aleria, (92) Peregrinus bishop of Lipara, (93) Boethius bishop of [Forum] Corneli, (94) Valentinus bishop of Thurii, (95) Luminosus bishop of Bononia, (96) Crescentius bishop of [Forum] Livii, (97) Stephen bishop of [Forum] Popilii, (98) Callionistus bishop of Hatria, (99) John bishop of Vicosabinae, (100) Potentius bishop of Pola, (101) Leontius bishop of Faventia, (102) Donatus bishop of Sassina, (103) John bishop of the Unnogours, (104) John bishop of Gabopolis, and (105) Victorinus bishop of Uzalis.

[36] Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

The blessed David says to God, 'Righteousness and judgement are the preparation of your throne, mercy and truth will go before your face.'²⁹ Therefore the holy synod of most God-beloved high priests in session with us, wishing, as is due, to perform this 'preparation' through the 'truth' of the proceedings for the glory of God and the imitation of his sacred throne, so that it should in this especially have its 'boast in him, in understanding and knowing the Lord and performing judgement and righteousness in the midst of the land',³⁰ has rightly sought not to investigate the preconceptions of the accused persons from their writings before examining and hearing of these from their accusers, fulfilling what was well said in the Books of Wisdom, 'Do not censure before you investigate; reflect first and then rebuke; before you hearken do not judge.'³¹ For even if our opponents' opinions are clear, it is necessary all the same, even where the matter is self-evident, for those investigating according to God to duly observe proper sequence in the investigation, so that in this way we may find as a fellow witness and fellow judge according to our prayers the God who said, 'Wherever two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them.'³² Therefore according to the lawful sequence that has piously been approved by us all, and with the help of those who are assisting the proceedings, namely the God-beloved men of our sacred secretariat, the

²⁹ Ps 88:15.

³⁰ Jer 9:23–4.

³¹ Sir 11:7–8.

³² Mt 18:20.





primicerius and the notaries, let there now proceed the presentation of those bringing charges, made known to us in orderly fashion by the address of the one introducing them.

Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

I report to your all-holy beatitude that Stephen the most sacred bishop of Dora, the first man in the priestly jurisdiction of Jerusalem, is standing before the doors of your sacred consistory and requests to be admitted and to give some information to your most holy synod. I have therefore referred the matter to your good pleasure.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Let Stephen the most God-beloved bishop of Dora, according to his own request, enter and duly present the information he wishes.

Stephen, the most God-beloved bishop of Dora, after taking his place in the holy synod, said:

I request your God-honoured holiness, if it is pleasing to you, to receive the plaint of my insignificance and order it to be read in your presence.

Martin the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome said:

[38] According to the request of Stephen the most God-beloved bishop of Dora, let his plaint be received from him and read.

And taking it, Anastasius, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out, translated from Greek into Latin:³³

The heading. To the holy and apostolic synod convened in this renowned and elder Rome according to the grace of God and the authoritative bidding³⁴ of Martin the thrice-blessed pope, who is religiously presiding over it for the sacred confirmation and vindication of the definitions and decrees of the fathers and councils of the catholic church, I, Stephen by the mercy of God bishop and first man in the jurisdiction subject to the archiepiscopal see of Jerusalem, present what follows.

³³ I translate the Greek text.

³⁴ As Jankowiak (2009) 264 points out, the word used (κέλευσις) was normally reserved for imperial commands. Pope Martin, in summoning a council with quasi-ecumenical pretensions, was indeed usurping an imperial prerogative.





The text. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and God of all consolation, who, by the blessed and episcopal convening of your most holy selves, has consoled us in all our affliction,³⁵ namely that which we feel for his holy catholic church because of those who oppose the word of faith. For like ‘wild waves’³⁶ they assailed and troubled her with their heresy, when, honoured by God, she was enjoying peace and calm, first of all Theodore bishop of Pharan, then Cyrus of Alexandria, and subsequently Sergius of Constantinople and his successors Pyrrhus and Paul.³⁷ For these men revived the doctrines of the heretics Apollinarius and Severus, by which they held and defined one will and one operation of the Godhead and manhood of Christ;³⁸ there is testimony to this in their writings, which they disseminated throughout the world for the deception of the more simple-minded. For they contrived not only to expound and record these doctrines but also to publish them openly, in opposition to all the doctrines of the fathers and councils of the church, by means both of chapters read out from the pulpit and written anathemas against those whose beliefs differed from theirs, and of decrees, subscriptions, and records of proceedings.³⁹

As a result of their troubling the whole catholic church in this way – in the words of the blessed Jeremiah, ‘we have been put to shame, because we heard reproach against us; it has covered our face with reversal, because aliens have entered our sanctuary’⁴⁰ – for this reason we the pious, all of us, have been looking everywhere, sometimes for ‘water for the head and fountains of tears for the eyes’⁴¹ for lamenting this pitiable catastrophe, and sometimes for ‘the wings of a dove’ (in the words of the divine David),⁴² so that we might ‘fly away’ and announce these things to the see that rules and presides over all others (I mean your sovereign and supreme see), in quest of healing for the wound inflicted. It has been accustomed to perform

35 Cp. 2 Cor 1:3–4.

36 Jude 13.

37 These are the five monoenergist and monothelete heresiarchs condemned in Session V (p. 384 below).

38 A florilegium in the acts of Session V includes extracts from Apollinarius and Severus of Antioch (pp. 348–51 below), in order to associate monotheletism with heretics condemned at previous councils: Apollinarianism had been condemned at the Council of Constantinople of 381, and Severus at the Synod of Constantinople of 536.

39 Many of these are given in the acts of Sessions III and IV.

40 Jer 28:51 (LXX) = 51:51 (MT).

41 Jer 8:23.

42 Ps 54:7.





this authoritatively from the first and from of old, [40] on the basis of its apostolic and canonical authority, for the reason, evidently, that the truly great Peter, the head of the apostles, was deemed worthy not only to be entrusted, alone out of all, with ‘the keys of the kingdom of heaven’⁴³ for both opening them⁴⁴ deservedly to those who believe and shutting them justly to those who do not believe in the gospel of grace, but also because he was the first to be entrusted with shepherding the sheep of the whole catholic church. As the text runs, ‘Peter, do you love me? Shepherd my sheep.’⁴⁵ And again, because he possessed more than all others, in an exceptional and unique way, firm and unshakeable faith in our Lord, [he was deemed worthy] to turn and strengthen his comrades and spiritual brethren⁴⁶ when they were wavering, since providentially he had been adorned by the God who became incarnate for our sake with power and priestly authority over them all.⁴⁷

Witnessing this, Sophronius of blessed memory, who was patriarch of the holy city of Christ our God and under whom I served as a priest, not conferring at all with flesh and blood⁴⁸ but like your most holy self caring only for the things of Christ, hastened without delay to send my nothingness, solely over this matter, to this great and apostolic see with his own appeals, explaining both in writing and orally through me your suppliant the whole innovation of the said men, which they had committed in opposition to the orthodox faith. In addition, while still alive, he in person put up a noble resistance to those in the East, charging and adjuring them to cease from their heresy and return to the pious faith of the fathers, providing in two books six centuries of patristic citations to refute their impiety and confirm the truth;⁴⁹ he did not, however, persuade them but excited them to calumny and wicked machinations against himself. Yet

43 Mt 16:19.

44 The required antecedent (‘the gates’) is not in the text.

45 Jn 21:16–17.

46 Cp. Lk 22:32.

47 This expresses the papalist theory that St Peter had unique authority among the apostles and that his role was fully and uniquely inherited by the popes of Rome. This theory was accepted in the East to the extent that it recognized that the popes had a special responsibility to stand up for the truth, but not in the sense that they were believed to possess a charism of truth in virtue of which their rulings were to be accepted without question or examination. See de Vries (1974).

48 Cp. Gal 1:16.

49 This lost work is also referred to a letter of Cyrus of Alexandria cited at p. 283 below. Sergius of Constantinople, writing to Pope Honorius, dismissed it as totally failing to prove





he was not at all alarmed on this account, nor did he ‘fear where there is no fear’,⁵⁰ for (says the scripture) ‘the just man is confident like a lion’,⁵¹ but, filled with godly eagerness and zeal, he took and placed me, despite my unworthiness, on holy Calvary,⁵² where, voluntarily on our behalf, the one who as God transcends us in nature, our Lord Jesus Christ, deigned to be crucified in the flesh. And there he bound me with unloosable bonds, saying:

‘To the God who voluntarily on our behalf was crucified in this holy place you yourself will have to render an account at his glorious and dread coming, when he will judge the living and the dead, if you ignore and overlook the danger to faith in him, even though I myself, as you know, am bodily prevented from acting by the incursion of the Saracens⁵³ as a result of our sins. Therefore proceed in haste from one end of the world to the other until you come to the apostolic see, where are the foundations of the pious doctrines, and acquaint the all-sacred men there, not once or twice but many times, with everything that has with precision been mooted here. You are not to desist from vigorous exhortation and entreaty, until with apostolic wisdom they bring their judgement to a victorious conclusion and issue canonically a total refutation of the outlandish doctrines, lest, as says the apostle, these any longer “spread like a cancer”,⁵⁴ feeding on the souls of the more simple-minded.’

[42] Wherefore, terrified and petrified at this because of the awesome judgement delivered by him on myself in this most awesome and venerable place, and then reflecting also on the episcopal dignity belonging to me by God’s leave, and on the petitions relating to the matter from almost all the God-loving bishops and Christ-loving congregations in the East, who in accord with the sainted Sophronius were urging me to go with this purpose as the first man in the jurisdiction of Jerusalem, I did not, to use scriptural language, ‘give sleep to my eyes and slumber to my eyelids and rest to my head’⁵⁵ in fulfilling this adorable command, but without any

that the fathers taught two operations in Christ (ACO² II/2, p. 540, 14–19; Allen (2009) 188–9).

⁵⁰ Ps 13:5.

⁵¹ Prov. 28:1.

⁵² The supposed site of Calvary is located within the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

⁵³ The standard Greek term in late antiquity for the Arabs living along the borders of Syria and Palestine. See Millar (2010) esp. 202–5.

⁵⁴ 2 Tim 2:17.

⁵⁵ Ps 131:4.





delay and solely for this purpose made the journey hither. Since then it is now the third time that I have arrived at your apostolic feet, entreating and beseeching what he and all of them have readily implored, namely, succour for the endangered faith of Christians. On discovering that I had acted in this way, my opponents piled no slight afflictions on me, sending instructions about me through places and regions that I should be apprehended and sent to them in irons, as is known to all. But the Lord came to my assistance and rescued my life from those in pursuit of it.⁵⁶ Therefore, as I pursued the goal and aimed at the prize⁵⁷ of your apostolic see, God did not overlook the petition of his servants presented with tears, but stirred up to no small degree the then apostolic high priests to warn and adjure the men aforesaid, even if in the event they had no success in pacifying them. He also stirred up the one who is now the sacred president, our master Martin, the thrice-blessed pope, whom he will guard for his churches safe and sound, with a long life, ‘expounding correctly the word of truth’,⁵⁸ so as incomparably and surpassingly to be ‘zealous with zeal for God’,⁵⁹ and to gather all of you most sacred high priests to himself for the rejection of outlandish doctrines and the preservation of those of the fathers of the church. I too exhort and beseech you to complete the work of grace for which God has summoned you through him, so that (as the scripture says) ‘you may remove the evil one from among you’,⁶⁰ for the divine apostle, writing to you Romans, exhorts you ‘to observe those who create scandals and divisions in opposition to the teaching you learnt and to shun them, for such people do not serve our Lord Jesus Christ but their own bellies, and by specious and fair words deceive the hearts of the innocent.’⁶¹

For as you know, most blessed one, the pious faith of the fathers cannot be blunted by innovation, but is accustomed, rather, to be strengthened by apostolic orthodoxy. Wherefore, rejecting every false belief, it ‘acknowledges one and the same our Lord and God Jesus Christ in two natures hypostatically united without confusion or separation, the difference between the natures being in no way removed by the union, but rather the distinctive character of each nature being preserved and coming together

56 Cp. Ps 117:13, 30:16, 108:31.

57 Cp. Phil 3:14.

58 2 Tim 2:15.

59 2 Cor 11:2.

60 1 Cor 5:13.

61 Rom 16:17–18.





into one person and one hypostasis⁶²; and accordingly it piously proclaims him complete God by nature and complete man by nature, apart from sin alone. [44] If then it proclaims him to be truly complete God by nature and complete man by nature, it is clear that he was in no way incomplete in the essential will and operation of either his Godhead or his manhood, but that he possessed without diminution his natural wills and operations, equal in number to his natures; it was by willing and performing what is divine and what is human by means of these that he was known to be truly both God and man. For if, as our opponents hold, he was incomplete in his divine and human will and operation according to nature, he was neither complete God nor complete man but was rather neither God nor man at all, since one who lacks divine will and operation by nature is not God by nature and likewise one who lacks human will and operation by nature is not man by nature. But he is neither incomplete God nor incomplete man, since both of Christ's natures, from which and in which⁶³ he is composed without confusion or separation, are acknowledged in natural completeness; and because of this he was complete by nature in each of his natures. It is therefore incumbent on us to reject these innovations and strengthen inviolably the orthodox faith of the holy fathers in the completeness of the natures that are preserved in union in Christ God and of his natural wills and operations, so as to profess that the natures, as united, of the one and the same are two, and that this is also true of his natural wills and operations, divine and human, for a total demonstration of the true completeness of each of his natures, such that there is no diminution of the essential and natural character or will and operation in either nature. For will and operation according to nature are clearly a natural property of a nature, and it is by means of them that the definition of the holy council at Chalcedon stands confirmed and preserves without diminution the mystery of Christ God.

But they, in their present attempt to confuse this mystery, have now devised another evil. For Paul, the primate of Constantinople, has induced our most pious emperor to issue a *Typos* about the faith, and in this *Typos* they have cast out the teachings of the holy fathers together with the evil doctrines of accursed heretics, decreeing that neither one nor two wills and operations are to be acknowledged in Christ God, making it easy to

62 From the Chalcedonian Definition, Price and Gaddis (2005) II, 204.

63 The combination of the 'from two natures' and 'in two natures' formulae is characteristic of the 'neo-Chalcedonianism' adopted under the emperor Justinian. See Price (2009) I, 71–2, 126.





proclaim in his case now one and now not even one, and consequently to describe him as either God alone, since possessing only a divine nature, or a mere man alone, since possessing only a human nature, or to describe him as neither God nor man, since possessing neither divine nor human will and operation but being in their view totally devoid of both will and operation.⁶⁴ This is something that the definition of the holy fathers and of the said holy council at Chalcedon totally prohibits, teaching that the natural property of each of the natures from which and in which is Christ is perfectly preserved after the union. Yet they, in their eagerness to reject both the council and all the holy fathers, have attempted to decree and record these things against the faith.

I have also to inform your holinesses that by exploiting the turmoil of the times and through lust for power they have led many in the East astray. [46] For Sergius bishop of Joppa, usurping the role of caretaker of the see of Jerusalem after the withdrawal of the Persians,⁶⁵ in virtue not of ecclesiastical procedure but secular power, ordained several bishops there, in contravention of the canons, as suffragans of the see of Jerusalem; {although he himself was far from having been confirmed, he presumed to ordain others}.⁶⁶ They, being well aware in consequence that their ordination was worthless, sent in their submission by letter, assenting to the innovation championed by Bishop Paul of Constantinople, so that indeed they might be irregularly confirmed by him, which was impossible. This fact I communicated earlier to the apostolic see, namely to the sainted pope Theodore; he by an apostolic letter appointed me his representative, despite my unworthiness, and by an all-sacred instruction bade me, apart from conducting other ecclesiastical business, to carry out a canonical deposition of the bishops ordained in this way, if they proved incorrigible. This indeed I did, particularly in view of the fact that of their own accord they had deserted the truth for error; in accordance with his injunction I only approved those who submitted a declaration of repentance and professed in writing that they had always held, embraced and preached the pious doctrines of the holy fathers and councils. These declarations I have now brought and presented to the thrice-blessed Pope Martin, who is presiding most sacredly over your

64 For criticism of the *Typos* that develops more fully the points made here, see pp. 264–7 below.

65 This was in 630. Sergius (who is not mentioned in any other source) appears to have administered the Jerusalem patriarchate between the death of Patriarch Modestus in 631 and Sophronius' elevation in 634.

66 Supplied from the Latin version.





holinesses, because some have been justly approved and others condemned, for the protection of the catholic church.

I therefore exhort you not to overlook the numerous and urgent petitions on this head (brought with tears to your beatitude by me in my insignificance) from my lowly self, all the orthodox priests and congregations in the East, and my afore-mentioned master, the sainted Sophronius. But, 'like luminaries in the world, keeping the word of life',⁶⁷ dispel the invading darkness of the heresy of the ill-named Apollinarius and Severus, which has been monstrously disseminated in our times by the men aforesaid, so that, once this is totally dispelled, there may rise upon us the daystar⁶⁸ and the dogmatic definition (illuminating everyone everywhere through your most holy selves) which the illustrious fathers of the church and the holy and ecumenical five councils confirmed for us by their pious doctrines, for the sure attainment of eternal life.

The subscription. I, Stephen, by God's mercy bishop of Dora and the first man of the holy synod subject to the patriarchal see of Jerusalem,⁶⁹ who composed the present plaint, have signed it with my own hand and presented it on Thursday, 8 October⁷⁰ in the eighth indiction.

[48] Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

To no small degree has Stephen, the most sacred bishop of Dora, by means of the information that he has just presented in his plaint, made known to us all the crimes that have been committed against holy men and orthodox doctrine by Theodore then bishop of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius of Constantinople, and his successors Pyrrhus and Paul, and how they exulted in placing their innovation precipitously in the midst of God's catholic church, 'saying in their heart', in the words of the great David, 'Come, let us expunge from the land all the feasts of God',⁷¹ namely the sacred statements of the holy fathers about the Saviour, to the extent of proclaiming without qualification that he has but one will and operation, or not even one, because 'there is no longer any prophet or teacher and he will know us no more'⁷² – thereby adulterating the word of truth. But they

67 Phil 2:15–16

68 Cp. 2 Pt 1:19.

69 The 'synod' of Palestine, in the sense of all the bishops of the region.

70 The Latin version has Tuesday, 6 October.

71 Ps 73:8.

72 Ps 73:9, 'or teacher' being an addition.





were unaware that they had been judged for this and rightly refuted by all the orthodox, even if they imposed hardships on them in requital for their boldness of speech, according to the scripture, ‘When I spoke to them, they made war on me gratuitously’,⁷³ being unrepentant for what they had committed; for ‘they hated those who convicted them in the gates and they abominated a sacred word, confirming for themselves a wicked word, to achieve their lawlessness and to hate’.⁷⁴ Since, then, this had been proved to us with precision through the reading of the plaint about the men aforesaid, it ought to be inserted in the proceedings as proof of the accusation brought against them by all the pious.

Theophylact, the *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

I inform your beatitude that there are standing outside the sacred consistory of your most holy self many devout hegumens and monks from among both the Greeks who have long resided here and those who have settled here recently, namely John, Theodore, Thalassius, George and with them other God-beloved men, requesting to be admitted and to present to your all-holiness a writing of theirs. Your beatitude will therefore consent to express your pleasure on this matter also.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God’s holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Let there enter in due order the God-beloved hegumens and monks who have announced themselves to the holy synod in session with us, and communicate freely the information they wish to give.

[50] John presbyter and hegumen of the sacred lavra of the sainted Sabas located in the desert near the holy city of Christ our God,⁷⁵ Theodore presbyter and hegumen of the sacred lavra located in the Christ-loving land of Africa,⁷⁶ Thalassius⁷⁷ presbyter and hegumen of the sacred community of the Armenians that is residing here in the monastery called

73 Ps 119:7.

74 Amos 5:10, Ps 63:6, Ps 35:3.

75 The original Palestinian monastery was devastated by Arabs in 614; refugees from it must have founded this community in the West. See Sansterre (1983) I, 22–9.

76 For this monastery see *ibid.* I. 25. Theodore’s signature below (p. 155) shows that this monastery too was dedicated to St Sabas.

77 Not to be confused with Thalassius the Libyan, to whom Maximus dedicated several of his works (Di Berardino (2006) 155–6).





‘of Renatus’,⁷⁸ George⁷⁹ presbyter and hegumen of the sacred community of the Cilicians that is residing here in the monastery called ‘at Aquae Salviae’,⁸⁰ and all the pious hegumens and monks with them took their stand before the holy synod and said:

We entreat your all-blessed holiness not to refuse to receive our written petition or plaint, but, if it is pleasing to you in your kindness, to bid this presentation about the orthodox faith be received by you and read.

Maximus the most holy bishop of Aquileia said:

In accordance with the request of the devout hegumens and monks standing here, may their plaint be received from them and read.

And, taking it, Theodore, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out, translated from Greek into Latin.⁸¹

The heading. To God’s holy and apostolic synod convened in concord and harmony by the favour and grace and inseparable communion of the all-holy Spirit in this renowned and elder Rome for the sacred confirmation and restoration of the pious and unimpeachable faith of us Christians, according to the sacred bidding and injunction of the one who by divine decree is the president and primate of you and of all, the priest of priests and father of fathers, our master Martin, the thrice-blessed pope, we, the assembly of the Greek hegumens and monks who reside here as servants of your holinesses, present the information that follows.

The text. God the Father’s really and by nature eternal Wisdom, our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, made the following adjuration and exhortation to all who desire the divine life now hidden in him and later to be revealed:⁸² ‘He who acknowledges me before men, I too shall acknowledge him before my Father in the heavens, but he who denies me and my words, I too shall deny him before my Father in the heavens,’⁸³ and, ‘He who loves his soul in this world will lose it, but he who hates his soul on my account will keep it for eternal life.’⁸⁴ We must of necessity,

78 Its location was probably south-east of the Esquiline (Sansterre (1983) I, 12).

79 The recipient of Maximus the Confessor’s *opusc.* 4, where he is described as ‘insatiable’ in his reading of scripture (PG 91. 57A).

80 Located south-east of St Paul’s Outside the Walls (Sansterre (1983) I, 13).

81 I translate the Greek text.

82 Cp. Col 3:3–4.

83 Mt 10:32–3.

84 Jn 12:25.





O most blessed one, [52] in all our resolutions choose the most holy faith of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ before the world that is drawing to an end, life that is perishing, and even our own lives. Accordingly, in common, when we were residing in the land of Africa,⁸⁵ we –and not only ourselves but also (in unison) every region and city, or rather the communities of priests and congregations of the faith residing in each⁸⁶ – besought this apostolic and sovereign see not to overlook the subjecting of the orthodox faith to innovation and the open rejection of the holy council at Chalcedon – this is to say, the rejection of all the holy and illustrious fathers by Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul, the primates of the imperial city, and also by Cyrus, then bishop of the city of Alexandria. These men, craftily making an invitation to the impious heretics a pretext and veil for their own innovation, introduced the false belief of the heretics themselves in opposition to the orthodox doctrines of the church, revealing their formerly hidden heresy by decreeing and ordaining that God's holy catholic church should acknowledge one will and operation in Christ, in agreement with the followers of Severus, Apollinarius, Nestorius and Theodore, the evil heretics who harmed the mystery of Christ God by fusion or separation.

By the holy, consubstantial and adorable Trinity, the cause of all that exists in nature, the sole everlasting Godhead and all the holy host and array of the angels in heaven, who ceaselessly in the ascription of glory offer up the Trisagion⁸⁷ hymn to the blessed Godhead, and the holy apostles, prophets, martyrs and teachers, and the holy and ecumenical four councils, those of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus I and Chalcedon, and also the holy fifth council, the second that convened in Byzantium, and, to sum up, all the saints from of old whose doctrines no less than their blood confirmed and established the holy faith and transmitted it to your most holy selves, we who are now present beg, entreat and beseech all you most holy fathers and the apostolic and sovereign see not to overlook the petitions of Christians over so many years and from all quarters addressed equally to God and to your most holy selves, nor the pleas presented with tears on this matter by our humble selves, whether present or absent, but canonically and in council to vindicate the most holy faith that is under attack from the aforesaid men, and (after God) to keep it safe for all, uncontaminated by innovation and resplendent as before with pious

85 This does not mean that all the signatories were in Africa at this date: some of them had already 'long' resided in Rome (p. 150 above).

86 This must refer to the African letters of 646 read out later at this session.

87 See Di Berardino (1992) II, 853.





teaching for the benefit of orthodox priests, laymen and monks throughout the world, since the hearts of all rely on you (after God), knowing that under Christ you are the supreme head of the churches. May these men – we mean Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus and Paul – and the declarations and teaching in support of their impious innovation, and all those who in any way, for whatever reason, in whatever time or place have been, or will be, seduced into agreement with them, transgressing against the definitions and doctrines of the fathers, be subjected to an anathema by name, and without the verdict against them being anonymous; for it is not the law of councils or the church [54] to impose an anonymous verdict naming no one, when an accusation is brought by name with reference to their writings.⁸⁸ Together with them the same anathema should in justice be imposed on the *Typos* that has now been issued against the orthodox faith by usurpation, without the knowledge or approval of our most pious emperor, but as the importunate teaching and instruction of Paul, who had been deposed by the predecessor of your all-holiness, we mean Theodore the sainted pope of your apostolic see.⁸⁹

In this *Typos* they have defined that the very God of glory our Lord Jesus Christ is entirely without operation or will,⁹⁰ that is, without mind or soul or motion, like the lifeless idols of the nations of which the great David said, ‘The idols of the nations are silver and gold, the works of men’s hands; they have a mouth and will not speak, they have eyes and will not see, they have nostrils and will not smell, they have ears and will not hear, they have hands and will not touch, they have feet and will not walk; may those who make them and all who have put their trust in them become like them.’⁹¹ For such is everything that is totally without operation or will, in consequence of the statement forbidding anyone at all from any acknowledgement of either one or two operations or wills in Christ, which is a complete repudiation of all the holy fathers and councils, or rather of the very mystery about Christ God. For not one of the holy fathers and councils

88 The Latin version understands the Greek differently: ‘when a plaint is presented personally and in writing’.

89 Pope Theodore harried Paul of Constantinople until he finally came out ambiguously in favour of the *Ekthesis*, in a letter read out at Session IV (pp. 254–60). Theodore retaliated by declaring him deposed and excommunicate, to which Paul in his turn retaliated with the *Typos*.

90 At Session IV, after the reading of the *Typos*, the same tendentious interpretation will be offered: by forbidding any further dispute over one or two operations and wills in Christ, the *Typos* was denying Christ all operation and will.

91 Ps 113:12–16.





pronounced and defined that our Lord and God Jesus Christ has no part by nature in divine or human operation and volition, but instead they firmly laid down that in the case of the one and the same God the Word incarnate, just as the display of his amazing and divine miracles and his acceptance of the voluntary and human passions confirm a divine nature and a human nature (namely that he possesses two natures in unmixed and inseparable union), so also they confirm both a divine will and operation and a human will and operation. This they did for the sake of a complete and genuine attestation of the true realities which, and from which and in which, is our one Lord and God, that is, of his Godhead and manhood by nature, since neither is without a share in natural operation and will; and they produced a synodical confirmation of piety, by defining that we are piously to affirm, in accordance with most divine tradition of the said holy fathers, that the natural operations and wills of the one and the same God the Word incarnate are two, just as the natures are.

It must be clearly known to your most holy selves that, if anything at all were to be defined by your beatitude contrary to this (we say) our pious petition on behalf of piety – of which perish the thought, and we do not in the least believe it, since it would be harmful to the integrity of the faith – we would stand before the event wholly free and innocent. Because of this, for the more complete edification and assurance of our insignificance, we beseech your holinesses that your present proceedings and pronouncements on behalf of the orthodox faith be translated with total precision and in every detail into Greek, so that, taking cognisance of these things with full knowledge, we may offer our assent in these matters to you most blessed ones, adhering inviolably to what you define correctly according to the sacred teaching and tradition of the holy fathers and councils (as has already been said) for the sake of a pure confession and faith in him, our Lord and God.⁹²

[57]⁹³ 1. John, presbyter and hegumen of the monastery of our father the sainted Sabas: I have signed this plaint with my own hand.

92 Though this peroration is presumably addressed to all the bishops, the Greek honorifics ‘most blessed’ and ‘beatitude’ were normally reserved for the pope, and the Greek text could be read as addressed to him alone. There was no real difference between addressing all the bishops directly and doing so via their president, and ambiguity of addressee is recurrent in conciliar acts.

93 The following list of signatories is found only in the Latin version. See pp. 136–7 above for information about some of them.





THE SECOND SESSION

155

2. Thalassius, by the mercy of God presbyter and hegumen [of the monastery] of the holy Mother of God and the blessed Andrew: I have signed this plaint with my own hand.

3. Theodore, by the grace of God presbyter and hegumen of the monastery of the venerable lavra of the sainted Sabas: I have signed this plaint with my own hand.

4. George, presbyter and hegumen, similarly.

5. Theodore, presbyter and hegumen, similarly.

6. Theocharistus, by the mercy of God presbyter, similarly.

7. Paul, by the mercy of God presbyter, similarly.

8. Theodore, presbyter, similarly.

9. Zosimus, presbyter, similarly.

10. John, presbyter, similarly.

11. Theodore, monk, similarly.

12. Polychronius, deacon, similarly.

13. Constantine, deacon, similarly.

14. Peter, deacon, similarly.

15. Theodore, deacon, similarly.

16. Sergius, monk, similarly.

17. Thomas, deacon, similarly.

18. George, deacon, similarly.

19. Stephen, deacon, similarly.

20. Sergius, monk, similarly.

21. Andrew, deacon, similarly.

22. Eutychius, monk, similarly.

23. Cosmas, monk, similarly.

24. Musonius, monk, similarly.

25. Abrahamius, monk, similarly.

26. John, monk, similarly.

27. Anastasius, monk, similarly.

28. Theodore, monk, similarly.

29. Theoctistus, monk, similarly.

30. Leontius, deacon, similarly.

31. Paul, monk, similarly.

32. Peter, monk, similarly.

33. John, monk, similarly.

34. Maximus, monk, similarly.⁹⁴

⁹⁴ This is presumed to be Maximus the Confessor.





35. Anastasius, monk, similarly.

36. Leontius, monk, similarly.

[58] Deusdedit the most holy bishop of Cagliari said:

The plaint of the devout hegumens and monks that has been read out contains, as you see, most blessed one, a clear and irrebuttable accusation against Cyrus and Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul, and their associates, to the effect that these men have disturbed with their wrong doctrines the whole church of our Saviour, which was happily at peace, asserting that Christ has but one, and not even one, will and operation, adulterating the faith with a show of piety, and failing to heed the warning spoken by the prophet, 'Woe to him who gives his neighbour a turbid draught to drink,'⁹⁵ and again in the Books of Wisdom, 'No one uttering unrighteousness will escape, nor will the judgement of condemnation pass him by, for there will be an investigation of the plotting of the impious, and the report of his words will reach the Lord for a condemnation of his lawless acts, because the ear of zeal hears everything and the hubbub of thoughts cannot be kept hid.'⁹⁶ For if these words had struck their minds, they would not have fallen into a vicious mentality, but keeping their thought under guard out of fear of God, they would have protected the fathers' pious definitions from innovation, for (says the scripture) 'a fair counsel will protect you and good cogitation will preserve you.'⁹⁷ Truly spurred by this innovation, the devout hegumens and monks have brought this accusation, adjuring us to condemn it canonically; in accord with the holy fathers they have clearly professed in their plaint that, just as the hypostatically united natures of the one and the same Christ are preserved, so also, equal in number to the natures, are his natural wills and operations. Willing and performing naturally by means of these both what is divine and what is human, he was truly recognised to be both God and man by nature, preserving permanently after the union the natural character of each of the natures from which he is, as we are taught by the definition of the holy fathers assembled at Chalcedon,⁹⁸ or rather by the whole choir of the saints. Because of this, we approve the insertion into our minutes of this their plaint, zealous and orthodox, for the refutation of the outlandish innovation of those they have accused.

⁹⁵ Hab 2:15.

⁹⁶ Wisd 1:8–10.

⁹⁷ Prov 2:11.

⁹⁸ Cp. in the Chalcedonian Definition 'the distinctive character of each nature being preserved', Price and Gaddis (2005) II, 204.





Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

I inform your all-sacred holiness of something that you yourself are well aware, since with great solicitude according to God you bear and possess an intelligently alert memory of everything most essential, that in your apostolic archives there are lying, kept in all security, many appeals from those in past times who, on the subject of the innovation that has lately been concocted by Cyrus and Sergius and their associates, besought your sovereign and apostolic see to condemn and anathematise it canonically. If, therefore, it is pleasing to your blessedness that some of these appeals be published in your present synodical proceedings for the more complete proof of the departure of our opponents from the patristic doctrines and of the accusation brought against them by all on this account, may you fitly express your pleasure.

[60] Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

For the confirmation of our synodical proceedings it is necessary, in accordance with the suggestion advanced by our God-beloved *primicerius*, that some of the appeals presented on this matter and lying in our apostolic archives be brought to light and read out by those with the pious task of assisting the proceedings.

Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

I have brought from our sacred archives and have to hand according to your pleasure the appeal of Sergius archbishop of the island of Cyprus, written by him in the recently elapsed first indiction, that is, seven years ago, to your holiness's predecessor Pope Theodore of blessed memory.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

May the appeal of Sergius bishop of the island of Cyprus, as has been suggested, be duly received and read.

And, taking it, Exsuperius, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out, translated from Greek into Latin:⁹⁹

The heading. To my most holy and most blessed master, appointed by

⁹⁹ I translate the Greek text.





God, father of fathers, archbishop and ecumenical patriarch Lord Theodore, Sergius, the most insignificant bishop, sends greetings in the Lord.

The text. Christ our God founded your apostolic see, O sacred head, as a divinely fixed and immovable support and conspicuous inscription of the faith. For you, as the divine Word truly declared without deceit, are Peter, and on your foundation the pillars of the church are fixed; to you he committed the keys of the heavens and decreed that you are to bind and loose with authority on earth and in heaven.¹⁰⁰ You have been made the destroyer of profane heresies, as the leader and teacher of the orthodox and unimpeachable faith.¹⁰¹ Therefore, my father, do not overlook the faith of our fathers, tempest-tossed, assailed and endangered by the winds of heresy; dissolve the mist of the demented by the light of your knowledge of God, O all-holy one, obliterate the blasphemies and the raging of the heretical teachers, newly sprouted and spouting novelties. For nothing is lacking to [62] your orthodox and apostolic ordinances and traditions, such that the faith should receive some addition from us. For we, being guided by God, and as the associates and colleagues of the holy apostles, have held and professed them from the first, indeed from the very cradle, proclaiming and affirming to all in the words of the holy and God-bearing Pope Leo, 'Each form operates in communion with the other.'¹⁰² With this all the God-bearing and all-holy fathers speak in accord, and it {has been followed}¹⁰³ by us the most insignificant servants and disciples. Therefore we do not tolerate the verbosity and adverse arguments of our opponents, for we are ready to undergo martyrdom in defence of the orthodox faith, with the support of the prayers of your most holy self. And if they were to choose to condemn the soul-destroying doctrines newly proposed in the fortunate [city of Constantinople]¹⁰⁴ (that is to say, for the destruction of the beliefs and profession of the holy fathers and of the supremely glorious and renowned Pope Leo), doctrines to which our own beliefs will not cease to be contrary, things would be well, the peace dear to God would be bestowed on the churches, every division in the churches abolished, and the

100 Cp. Mt 16:18–19.

101 Sergius is clearly aware of Theodore's letter to the emperor Constans II, written a few months previously, in which he demanded the withdrawal of the monothelete *Ekthesis* (Winkelman (2001) 103–4).

102 The famous sentence from Leo's Tome, Price and Gaddis (2005) II, 19.

103 Supplied from the Latin version.

104 'The fortunate [city]' was a Greek title of Constantinople, translated in the Latin Acts as *regia urbs* (the imperial city).





schisms healed, with a restoration of unity. But since they do not follow you apostolic fathers,¹⁰⁵ taught by God, we anathematise them both in writing and orally. For it is neither godly nor right, indeed it is not, when the plague of heresy is present and blasphemous anathemas have been composed, to engage in a battle of words. May they at all events respect what is rational, be in awe of God, and withdraw these blasphemies; and then, at whatever time or place they choose, let us discuss the doctrines about which they think to hold an opinion.

In brief, therefore, most holy ones, what we say is this: let there be condemned the writings that seek to refute and condemn the God-bearing fathers, the all-holy Pope Leo, and you who speak of God. Since at your command, our masters and divinely inspired fathers, we too, as has already been said, strike them with anathemas, let us then initiate proposals and contests on the matters they are examining, since we are filled with hope by your support, which is both taught and inspired by God, since we shall not be timorous or ‘craven with fear where there is no fear’,¹⁰⁶ when the subject is God and the orthodox faith. Until today, while they were practising a certain accommodation, we have remained silent, thinking that they would change their doctrines for the better. For such were also the convictions of our divine Arcadius,¹⁰⁷ now among the saints, heeding your orthodox teaching, whose steps we pray to follow with all our strength, concurring with your orthodox and divinely inspired teaching, our most holy masters and fathers; for we shall endure no longer those who scatter tares and stumbling-blocks,¹⁰⁸ so to speak, throughout the world. These are the beliefs of our sacred synod, which approves and embraces the Tome of the all-holy and God-bearing Leo, confirms it as a salvific anchor of orthodoxy, exults in the doctrines of your knowledge of God, while falsifying nothing at all, [64] and prays to depart to the Lord and stand before his dread tribunal with this orthodox profession.

May God, the Creator of all things, protect through a long life our

105 The ‘fathers’ are the bishops who would confer with Pope Theodore in council. From now, until the subscription, it is they rather than the pope who are addressed in the second person.

106 Ps 13:5.

107 For Arcadius, Sergius’ predecessor as primate of Cyprus, see Winkelmann (2001) 67–71, 196–8. Although claimed by both Sergius and Maximus the Confessor as a critic of the monotheletes, the Syriac Life of Maximus gives a detailed account of a Cypriot synod he chaired that condemned the teaching of Sophronius and Maximus. See pp. 10–11 above.

108 Cp. Mt 13:25, 18:7.





all-holy master for the support of his holy churches and the orthodox faith, the good shepherd who offers his life for his spiritual sheep and drives away the ravenous wolves with his pastoral staff.¹⁰⁹ To all those privileged to serve my all-holy master, honoured by God, I and those with me send abundant greetings in the Lord.

The subscription. Father of fathers, honoured by God, pray that I may enjoy good health and be well-pleasing to the Lord.

This was written and sent on 29 May in the first indiction.¹¹⁰

Maurus the most devout bishop of Cesena and Deusdedit presbyter of Ravenna, the representatives of Maurus the most holy bishop of Ravenna, spoke through one of them, Maurus bishop of Cesena:

In relation to what has now been read to us from the appeal of Sergius archbishop of the island of Cyprus about the persons accused by him because of their outlandish innovation, it is opportune for us too to utter, as is fitting, what was spoken by the blessed Jeremiah in the person of God, 'Heaven was appalled at this and earth shuddered still more, because those in opposition have done two wicked things: they have deserted me, the spring of living water, and they have dug for themselves broken cisterns, which will not be able to hold water.'¹¹¹ For a 'broken cistern' is every word contrived by human devising to contain error, easy to demolish, and which does not proceed from the springs of salvation to the attainment of eternal life. Therefore the great apostle gave us a rational confirmation by saying, 'Do not cherish high thoughts beyond what one ought to think, but think with sober thoughts,'¹¹² keeping to the bounds of piety, since 'those who disregarded them not only suffered harm through falling from their own steadfastness, but left to those living a reminder of their folly, so that their failures could not remain hid.'¹¹³ For 'glory and dishonour', says the scripture, 'are in speech, and the tongue of a man is his downfall.'¹¹⁴

Therefore it is fitting that this appeal be inserted in our minutes to expose the embattled heresy, and that we do not overlook the complaints, written and oral, addressed on this matter to the apostolic see, but that

109 Cp. Jn 10:11–12.

110 29 May 643.

111 Jer 2:12–13, 'those in opposition' being an addition.

112 Rom 12:3.

113 Wisd 10:8, 'through falling from their own steadfastness' being an addition taken from 2 Pt 3:17.

114 Sir 5:13





with all probity we duly bring about a total removal of the contrary speech of ‘chaff’ by means of the ‘flail’¹¹⁵ of a canonical examination, on the basis of the nourishing and mature doctrine of the catholic church, which strengthens the heart of man through participation in the teaching of the fathers.

[66] Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

I inform your beatitude that I have brought and have to hand another appeal concerning the present matter under examination, namely that of the most sacred bishops in the Christ-loving region of Africa, sent by them in the recently past fourth indiction¹¹⁶ to your most holy one’s predecessor Pope Theodore of holy memory. Deign therefore to make known your pleasure in its regard.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God’s holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

We order that the appeal of the God-beloved bishops of Africa, as has just been suggested, be read out to the holy synod in session with us.

And, taking it, Theodore, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out:¹¹⁷

[67] To the most blessed lord and elevated apostolic eminence, the holy father of fathers Theodore, pope and supreme pontiff of all the bishops, [from] Columbus bishop of the first see of the synod of Numidia, and Stephen bishop of the first see of the synod of Byzacena, and Reparatus bishop of the first see of the synod of Mauretania,¹¹⁸ and all the bishops of the said three synods of the region of Africa.

That there is in the apostolic see a great and inexhaustible spring pouring forth abundantly for all Christians, from which flow forth rivulets that generously water the entire Christian world, no one can dispute. In honour of the most blessed Peter, {O father of fathers},¹¹⁹ the decrees of the fathers decreed for it unique and total reverence, in the investigation of the

115 Cp. Mt 3:12.

116 September 645 to August 646.

117 I translate the Latin version, which is the original text, as of the other African letters, as Caspar (1932) demonstrated, against the contrary claim by Peitz (1917) 216, n. 1.

118 In these three provinces primacy depended not on occupying a particular see (the metropolis) but on seniority by date of consecration. Gregory the Great tried to change this rule and failed (Gregory, *epp.* I. 72, 75).

119 Supplied from the Greek version.





affairs of God that need a full and careful examination, and most justly, since these need to be examined by the apostolic crown of the bishops, whose concern from of old has been both to condemn evil and approve what is worthy of praise. For it was laid down in ancient regulations that nothing, even if raised in remote and far distant provinces, should [69] first be treated or accepted until it had been brought to the notice of your bountiful see, so that the sentence pronounced might be confirmed by her just authority, and the other churches might take from there, as from their native source, the origin of their preaching, and there might abide through the various regions of the whole world, unsullied in their purity, the mysteries of the saving faith.¹²⁰ Therefore we pay to your apostolic eminence our most humble respects, which we offer with tears, since we cannot hold back our heartfelt groans.

Some time ago a detestable concoction of novelty in the city of Constantinople was relayed to us by report; we have until now remained silent, because we presumed that it had been severely condemned by the judgement of your apostolic see. But when we learnt that it was steadily growing stronger, and read the petition of our brother Pyrrhus, lately our fellow bishop in the same city of Constantinople, which was presented to your venerable see, we sent an appeal, such as necessity required, to our brother Paul, who now occupies the church of the city of Constantinople, beseeching him with many tears to repel from himself and the whole church over which he presides the aforesaid concoction of novelty (invented not indeed in his own day and rebutted, of course, by its originator)¹²¹ and to remove all the documents posted on the doors of holy church herself¹²² as a stumbling-block for the congregations, in order that the faith that has endured until now may be preserved in its integrity and the apostolic teaching may be preserved unharmed. For it is certain that such novelties of speech result from an evil desire for glory, when some people wish to appear acute, intelligent and wise, and seek out something new to present, unaware that our God chooses what in the world is weak

120 This statement that all decisions should be referred to the Roman see is taken from a letter (dating to 416) from Innocent I to a council of Carthage (*ep.* 29. 1, PL 20. 582–3). The text given in ACO is corrupt and has to be corrected by reference to the original text.

121 Namely Pyrrhus, though the originator of monothelism was, rather, his predecessor Sergius.

122 It was customary for official doctrinal statements to be posted on the doors of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, e.g. Justinian's edict on the orthodox faith of 551 (Price (2009) I, 48, 163).





in order to confound what is strong and has confounded the wise through what in the world is foolish.¹²³ He should have read with care the words of the teacher of the Gentiles to Timothy, in which he tells him to ‘shun profane novelties of speech’,¹²⁴ since they lead to impiety and have always produced thorns and thistles, and ‘to remain at Ephesus and charge certain persons not to teach any different doctrine’.¹²⁵ And to cite something from the ancients, there are the words of the prophet Jeremiah: ‘Dread things’, he says, ‘have occurred on earth and prophets prophesy wickedness.’¹²⁶ [71] But the divine law contains many lessons which may pour forth as our little streams from the abundant spring of your eminence.

But since our province of Africa has been mentioned as an object of a certain suspicion by malevolent men in the aforesaid imperial city,¹²⁷ we have sent to your beatitude, dear to God, the said appeal to our aforesaid brother Paul, bishop of Constantinople. We humbly request you to forward it through the *apocrisiarii* of your most sacred see, so that we may happily learn if our aforesaid brother has turned from the wicked fabrication of novelty back to the pure preaching of the orthodox faith.¹²⁸ But if he is dissembling, the authority of your bountiful see will reflect, with salutary deliberation according to the ordinances of the fathers, how to separate this unhealthy wound from the healthy body, so that, through the careful removal of the infection of the raging disease, the unaffected part may survive, and the flock, pure once more, may be cleansed by the spiritual knife of your eminence from this plague of evil.

Finally we must truly mention the following constraining event that came to pass, namely that when we were specially gathering together the venerable synods of each and every province¹²⁹ and intending, after

123 Cp. 1 Cor 1:27. The whole sentence is taken from a letter (dating to 430) from Pope Celestine I to the clergy and people of Constantinople (ACO I. 2, p. 17, 5–10).

124 1 Tim 6:20.

125 1 Tim 1:3.

126 Jer 5:30–1. The preceding passage (from ‘He should have read with care’) follows closely a letter (dating to 430) from Pope Celestine to Nestorius (ACO I. 2, p. 8, 16–22).

127 The cause of this suspicion is not clear. Possibly the reference is to African support for the rebellion by the African exarch Gregory (Haldon (1990) 307), but this rebellion was most probably later than this letter.

128 The same request is made, and with the same explanation, in the letter of Victor of Carthage (p. 186 below). The fear, presumably, was that envoys from Africa would be placed under arrest.

129 The Greek version, which speaks of ‘a synod from the whole land’, understood this to mean the convocation of a single council of the ‘synods’ (in the sense of groups of bishops)





choosing brethren from our fellowship, to send a full embassy with our appeals, something sprung up that for a good reason thwarted our intention. But because the constraint that we have mentioned affected the entire province of Africa,¹³⁰ we have (with good fortune) sent this joint appeal to your pre-eminence, by means of legates appointed for various synods, entreating you to attribute [our failure] not to us but to the constraint that arose.¹³¹

{Columbus, bishop of the first see of the synod of Numidia}:¹³² pray for us, holy and most blessed lord, father of fathers.

{Stephen, bishop of the first see of the synod of Byzacena}: pray for us, holy and most blessed lord, father of fathers.

{Reparatus, bishop of the first see of the synod of Mauretania}: pray for us, holy and most blessed lord, father of fathers.

[70] Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

The appeal from the God-beloved bishops of Africa that has now been read is known to be general and universal, since coming from each of the ecclesiastical hierarchies established there according to God.¹³³ This is clear from the signatures reliably attached to it. For as we have read, beloved brethren, it gives in first place the most devout Columbus bishop of Numidia, who is the [72] primate of the bishops of its holy synod, then the most devout Stephen, the president of the holy synod of Byzacena, and finally the most devout Reparatus, the president of the synod of Mauretania, all of whom agree in censuring the outlandish innovation and

of the various provinces. But the natural reading of the Latin is that a synod was to be held in each province.

130 This could refer to Berber raids, or to turmoil resulting from the revolt by the exarch Olympius. But in any case this is simply an excuse for a failure to produce an impressive line-up of anti-monothelete African bishops.

131 This document is trying to say two different things at the same time: that the holding of a synod in each province, with a consequent sending of a legation representative of all of them, has been frustrated by adverse circumstances, but that, nevertheless, legates from various provinces – amounting to much the same thing – will be conveying this document.

132 This and the other bishops' names are supplied from the Greek, since the Latin gives only their threefold greeting, which suggests that it derives from the original draft of the letter, before the bishops' signatures had been sought. The 'constraining event' just mentioned as preventing a synod of all the African bishops is likely, however, to have prevented a meeting of the three primates, and their signatures may never have been obtained.

133 The absence of Proconsularis is made up for by the last two documents read at this session.





entreat our apostolic and sovereign see to rise up and condemn it; out of a surpassing love of God they also, in their appeal to our most pious emperor, denounced those who defend this innovation, to be precise, Bishop Paul of Constantinople. Accordingly they composed a further synodical letter on this matter to Paul himself, to the effect that he should cease to defend what had been published by his predecessor Sergius contrary to reason for the overturning of the decrees of the fathers and the councils; and having shared in our joy at what happened at that time, I mean the supplication in a written petition, they also mentioned it, namely the conversion of Pyrrhus, who corrected his own error, even if in his folly he reverted to it again.¹³⁴

Since, therefore, in this appeal of theirs they made mention of the other appeals of which they sent copies to our apostolic see, while this one should be inserted into the guarantee of the minutes, there should also be brought and read to the holy synod here present copies of the two appeals just mentioned, in which the said devout bishops of the region of Africa displayed, as is fitting, both the zeal and the purity of their faith.¹³⁵ For in this way through their reading the force of our proceedings will become in a way yet stronger, by exposing how our opponents were in no way induced by the protests of other provinces or churches to correct their own doctrines.

Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

According to the orders of the your beatitude, I have brought copies of the two other appeals from your holy archives and have them to hand for your good pleasure.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Let the copy of the synodical appeal written to our most pious emperor by the God-beloved bishops of Africa be received first and duly read to the holy synod here present.

134 The reference is to Pyrrhus' supplication sent to Pope Theodore, recanting his monotheletism. In fact, Pyrrhus and this document are referred to in the letter (just read) from the African primates and alluded to in the letter to the emperor, but not in the letter to Paul.

135 The only appeal referred to in the letter from the three primates was one to Paul from themselves. This must be distinct from both the documents that now follow.





And, taking it, Paschalis, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out:¹³⁶

[75] To the lord most clement, lord of land and sea, Constantine¹³⁷ Augustus, [from] Stephen bishop of the first see and all the bishops of the synod of Byzacena, the most insignificant servants of your piety.

God Almighty, providing for his church, has appointed for her protection foreknown and predestined emperors of the Roman name, so that, however often a storm of the devil's party tries to stir up something against her, it may be suppressed by the firmness of your clemency, in order that through the solicitous assistance of your power her tranquillity may be secured. For by service you place your authority under the one by whose gift and protection you rule; wherefore, having been divinely preordained, you make solicitude for her your special and primary care. In consequence there applies to you and the same holy church spread throughout the world the scripture, 'Kings will be your foster-fathers',¹³⁸ and likewise there is the scripture, 'The honour of a king loves judgement.'¹³⁹ For, while you prefer divine affairs to human ones and give priority to the orthodox faith over secular concerns, what is it other than right judgement that you offer up to the worship of God?

For this reason all we priests of the Lord in your Africa¹⁴⁰ beseech your piety in the presence of the Lord that the scandal of novel presumption that has assailed our faith be removed, and that you deign by imperial authority to compel Paul our brother, bishop of the church of Constantinople, to hold orthodox beliefs together with us, that is, with the entire [Christian] community. For we ought to preserve the correct faith handed down to us by the holy fathers without addition or diminution, since whatever is either increased or reduced is proved to have never been perfect, and what the enemies of Christ, the heretics, will say about it is doubtful to nobody.

We have written to our aforesaid brother and fellow bishop Paul¹⁴¹ by the bearers of the present letter, so that they in our place, with the help of an injunction from your clemency, may admonish him about the instructions

136 I translate the Latin version, which is the original text.

137 Constantine was the official name of the emperor who in both Byzantine and modern writing is generally called Constans II (641–68).

138 Is 49:23.

139 Ps 98:4.

140 This phrase ('cuncti vestrae Africae domini sacerdotes') is understood by Hefele-Leclercq (1909) III/1, 428 to mean that the bishops of Byzacena were writing on behalf of all the African bishops. But 'all' need refer to no more than the signatories of this letter.

141 This must be distinct from the letter to Paul referred to elsewhere at this session, which was signed only by the bishops of Proconsularis.





we gave. Commending them to your gentleness, all of us unanimously, bending the knee of the mind, entreat that the prayers of our petition be brought to fulfilment. For this reason it is of advantage for his standing and reputation that he should not leave uncorrected by himself or by others what the originator of such presumption¹⁴² himself corrected, and that he should not permit the stumbling-block to be defended even now. We have instructed our embassy, suppliant to your piety,¹⁴³ [77] that they should not delay from conveying to the pious hearing of your serenity what we have written to our aforesaid brother, so that your piety, versed in love of the Godhead, may order the bestowal of imperial assistance for the peace of the churches of God, in order that, enjoying the peace that passes all understanding, your rule may be continue secure and peaceful for countless years.

May our God the Almighty, by whose power all things are directed, look down benevolently on your reign, and deign by the right hand of his power to subject the pagan nations, who trust in their savagery, to your piety's most Christian authority.

The signatures¹⁴⁴

1. [77] Stephen bishop of the first see: I have signed this our pious petition.

2. Secundus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Tagenensis: I have signed the present pious petition.

3. Datianus by the grace of God bishop of Turris Blanda: I have signed this our pious petition.

4. John by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Mibiarcensis: I have signed this pious petition.

5. Saturninus bishop of the holy church of Marazana:¹⁴⁵ I have signed this pious petition.

¹⁴² Paul's predecessor Pyrrhus.

¹⁴³ Considering the reluctance of the African primates to send envoys to Constantinople (see pp. 163 and 186), one may doubt whether this embassy was ever dispatched and this letter ever delivered.

¹⁴⁴ The Greek MSS give only the first three names, and then 'And another forty God-beloved bishops of the land of Africa signed together with them in the holy council.' Of the three Latin MSS only the Laon codex gives the full list. The bishops now listed are all of the province of Byzacena. The place-names are given in adjectival form, which I generally reproduce, since in only some cases is the substantival form known. For the names and their occurrence in other lists see Maier (1973) and Mandouze (1982).

¹⁴⁵ See Maier (1973) 166 for this identification of the 'Miricianesis' of the MS.





168 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

6. Januarius by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Gatianensis, as above.

7. Venerius by the mercy of God humble bishop of the holy church of the city of Thysdrus, as above.

8. Romulus by the grace of the Lord God humble bishop of the holy church of the city of Thiges, as above.

9. Candidus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of the fatherland of Dices, as above.

10. Restitutus by the mercy of God bishop of the holy church of Jubaltiana, as above.

11. Fortunius by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Zella, as above.

12. Crescentinus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of the city of Leptis [Minus], as above.

13. Stephen by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Thelepte, as above.

14. Evasius by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Vicus Ateri, as above.

15. Donatus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Limisa, as above.

16. Theodore by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of the city of Tamazeni, as above.

17. Optatus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Autenti, as above.

18. Constantine by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Aeliae, as above.

19. Stephen by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Taraquensis, as above.

20. Victorinus by the mercy of God bishop of the holy church of Temunianensis, as above.

21. Paschasius by the mercy of God bishop of the holy church of Decorianensis, as above.

22. Julian by the mercy of God bishop of the holy church of Ruspae, as above.

23. Sallustius by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Febianensis, as above.

24. [79] Donatus by the mercy of God bishop of the holy church of Unizibirensis, as above.

25. Theodore humble bishop of the holy church of Hirina, as above.





26. Beatus Stephanus Spisindeo by the mercy of God bishop of the holy church of Quaestorianensis, as above.

27. Mustulus by the mercy of God bishop of the holy church of Cabarsussi, as above.

28. Beatus Laurentius Tarasus humble bishop of the holy church of the city of Usula, as above.

29. Stephen by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of the city of Gummi, as above. I, Bishop Stephen, have signed this our petition.

30. Boniface by the piety of God bishop of the holy church of Justiniana Maximianensis, as above.

31. Cyriacus by the grace of God bishop ..., ¹⁴⁶ as above.

32. Januarius by the mercy of God bishop of the holy church of Bahanna, as above.

33. Felix by the grace of God bishop of the holy catholic church of the city of Thenae, as above.

34. Quintus humble bishop of the holy church of Achulla, as above.

35. Spes by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Crepedulensis, as above.

36. Nepus by the grace of God bishop ..., as above.

37. Felix by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of the municipality of Segermes, as above.

38. Pentasius by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Turris Tamalleni, as above.

39. Boniface by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Sassura, as above.

40. Numidius humble bishop of the holy church of Sofiana Junci, ¹⁴⁷ as above.

41. Benaclus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Hermiane, as above.

42. Rodibaldus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Valentinianensis, as above.

[78] Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

In their appeal the God-beloved bishops of Africa have fulfilled the

¹⁴⁶ Here, as at no. 36 below, the name of the see is accidentally omitted by the MS.

¹⁴⁷ Junci must have added 'Sofiana' to its name in honour of the empress Sophia, the wife of Justin II.





psalm verse that says, 'I spoke of your testimonies before kings and was not put to shame.'¹⁴⁸ For it is certainly not shame but rather glory that attends the declaration of the divine doctrines to kings and private persons alike by the high priests of the catholic church, who announce with great courage the gospel of grace. This is why the said God-beloved bishops have addressed the most pious emperor with great boldness, declaring that 'the honour of a king loves a judgement'¹⁴⁹ that is truly pleasing to God, and which makes the bad be shunned and orders the good to prevail, confirmed by imperial law. It is through this law that they intended to rescue Paul himself, primate of Constantinople, from his fall, so that through his rejection of the novel teaching the faith of the holy fathers would be firmly professed, without any addition or subtraction.

[80] Therefore, while this appeal (I am referring to the one written by the Africans to our most pious emperor) is inserted in our proceedings, it is necessary that we should also hear a reading of the synodical letter they sent to Paul himself.

And, taking it, Exsuperius, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out:¹⁵⁰

[81] To the most blessed and honourable lord and holy brother Patriarch Paul [from] Gulosus, Probus and the other bishops of the holy synod of Proconsularis, whose subscriptions will be appended below.

The head and foundation of the faith of the catholic, or universal, church is our God Jesus Christ the Lord, who, possessing together with the Father and the Holy Spirit an inseparable nature of Godhead, said to his disciples, as the gospel teaches us, 'Go and teach all the nations, baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit';¹⁵¹ for by saying in the 'name' and not in the 'names' he revealed to those who worship him faithfully and believe in him sincerely an inseparable union and not a division. Therefore the blessed apostles, fulfilling the injunction of their teacher our Lord Jesus Christ, preached throughout the world the sound and correct doctrine of how one must worship God, and how one must believe that Christ his Son, our God and Lord, is both God and man, and that the Holy Spirit is coeternal and coequal in Godhead with the Father and the Son.

Although, therefore, the holy catholic church remains united in this

148 Ps 118:46.

149 Ps 98:4.

150 I translate the Latin version, which is the original text.

151 Mt 28:19.





true and unimpeachable worship of God, yet through the devil's envy death entered¹⁵² into the hearts of faithless men, who, veering from the path of truth according to the error of a depraved conscience, 'strayed from the faith', in the words of the apostle, 'and involved themselves in many sorrows',¹⁵³ opposing the catholic faith through heresies corresponding to the evil thoughts of each. Against these heresies were at that time convened by the sacred decrees of most Christian princes councils of venerable bishops, at which, having investigated the cunning of the various heretics and their crafty and subtle deceit against the correct faith, the holy and true bishops, condemning all the heretics in advance, issued a unanimous declaration of the orthodox faith, pure and clearly expressed, in which they laid down how the belief of the faithful people should endure, firm and ineradicably rooted, and how we should profess the person of Christ our Lord and God, by condemning whoever should dare to make any additions or changes to these [truths] or remove anything from them. This pious and holy enactment, pleasing to God, [83] was gladly accepted by the whole faithful church; and through so many ages this most firm definition, pure and intact, has been held and upheld by orthodox believers.

Because we have learnt that some contrary tenets, opposed to the decrees of the faithful and most ancient fathers and the universal councils, have been propounded in the city of Constantinople by the statements of a certain venomous document, we are amazed and indeed distressed that these were allowed by you to remain in force and were not immediately suppressed and excised from the roots by an orthodox priestly resolution. Therefore all the things that lately in the time of Sergius, then patriarch, were adopted and taught in opposition to the definitions of the fathers and holy orthodox councils that confirmed the catholic faith through the teaching of the apostles we ourselves condemn as execrable, while we embrace all the decrees of the holy fathers, in which our faith, firm and correct, remains through the grace of Christ intact and utterly safe from corruption. There is no need for us to reopen matters that have been well expressed and decreed once and for all, lest we be provoked into argument and place ourselves in danger, incurring the anathema laid down by the fathers, if we presume to say anything more than they did, or change or delete anything, or add (perish the thought!) these new and perverse

152 Cp. Wisd 2:24.

153 Cf 1 Tim 6:10.





articles that are now conceived, heretical and in opposition to God.¹⁵⁴ For on those who accept such things there is justly imposed a divine penalty, unless by tears of penitence they turn their hearts, purified, back to Christ, against whom they offend.

What has been accepted by the holy, correct and true faith, according to the preaching and profession of the universal and immaculate church, we advocate and uphold, namely that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are an inseparable trinity, one God, and that one of the Holy Trinity, the Son of God, namely Christ our Lord and God, possesses true human flesh together with a rational and intellectual soul, while in no way laying aside or diminishing his Godhead. Instead, we acknowledge the same Jesus Christ our Lord to be both God and man, and affirm that he possesses a divine nature, will, and operation as perfect God, while as regards the manhood the same, yet without any form of sin or concupiscence, likewise possesses an utterly complete nature, will and operation, with the result that in our Lord and God Jesus Christ there are two natures, two operations, and two natural wills, as has been, and is, the invariable teaching of the catholic church.

So that the preceding may be most abundantly confirmed by citations from the holy fathers, we have hastened to insert citations from them, a few out of many, in this our epistolary declaration.

[85] 1. From the book of Saint Ambrose bishop of Milan, *inter alia*:¹⁵⁵

The apostle says, 'He did not think it robbery that he was equal to God.'¹⁵⁶ For what someone does not have, he tries to obtain by robbery. Therefore it was not as robbery that he enjoyed equality with the Father, for he possessed it in his own substance as Lord and God. Accordingly he added, 'He took the form of a servant.'¹⁵⁷ A 'servant' is surely the opposite. He was therefore equal 'in the form of God',¹⁵⁸ but less in taking flesh and in suffering as man. For how could the same nature be both less and equal?

154 A favourite argument against new doctrinal formulations was that they incurred the anathema decreed in Canon 7 of Ephesus I (431) against the introduction of new creeds. Cp. Eustathius of Berytus at Ephesus II (449), in Acts of Chalcedon I. 988 (Price and Gaddis [2005] I, 347–8).

155 Ambrose, *De fide* II. 8, 86–99, CSEL 78, p. 81. The second half of this citation (from 'Therefore he was equal') reappears in a florilegium in Session V (pp. 306–7, no. 2).

156 Phil 2:6.

157 Phil 2:7.

158 Phil 2:6.





How, if it is less, does he do the same things, and in the same way, that the Father does? For how could the same operation go with diversity of power? Surely the lesser cannot operate as the greater does? Or can there be one operation where there is difference of substance? Therefore accept that Christ cannot be called less in respect of his Godhead.

2. Likewise by the same author as above:¹⁵⁹

So Christ is afraid, although Peter is not afraid. For Peter says, 'I shall lay down my soul for you,'¹⁶⁰ while Christ says, 'My soul is troubled.'¹⁶¹ Both [sayings] are true and both accord fully with reason – the fact that the one who is inferior does not fear, and the fact that the one who is superior exhibits the emotion of fear. For the former as man is ignorant of the power of death, while the latter as God present in a body expresses the weakness of the flesh, so as to leave no scope for the impiety of those who deny the mystery of the incarnation. In fine, he said this and yet Mani did not believe it, Valentinus denied it, and Marcion judged it to be an apparition. He went so far in equalling man in emotion (while displaying manhood by the reality of his body) that he said, 'Yet not as I will but as you will.'¹⁶²

3. Likewise from the book of the same author as above:¹⁶³

Listen to him acting as he wills; for he said, 'I willed to do your will, my God,'¹⁶⁴ and in another place, 'Voluntarily shall I sacrifice and confess'¹⁶⁵ to you.'¹⁶⁶

[87] 4. Likewise from book of the same author as above:¹⁶⁷

What indeed is there that the Father wills and the Son does not, or the Son wills and the Father does not? 'The Father makes alive those he wills, and the Son makes alive those he wills,' as it is written.¹⁶⁸ Say now whom the Son is to have made alive and the Father is not to have willed to make alive? Since, however, the Son makes alive those he wills and the operation

159 *De fide* II. 5, 28–40, CSEL 78, p. 71.

160 Jn 13:37.

161 Jn 12:27.

162 Mt 26:39.

163 *De fide* II. 6, 18–20, CSEL 78, p. 73.

164 Ps 39:9.

165 The words 'and confess' are not to be found in the original text of Ambrose.

166 Ps 53:8.

167 *De fide* II. 6, 29–7, 41, CSEL 78, pp. 73–76.

168 Jn 5:21.





is one,¹⁶⁹ note that not only does the Son do the will of the Father, but also the Father the will of the Son. What is this ‘making alive’ unless it is by means of the passion of the Son? Now the passion of Christ is the will of the Father, and so those whom the Son makes alive he makes alive by the will of the Father. Therefore there is one will. What, however, is the will of the Father, save that Jesus should come into this world and cleanse us from faults? Listen to the leper saying, ‘If you will, you can cleanse me.’¹⁷⁰ Jesus replied, ‘I do will,’ and at once he was made well. Do you see that the Son is the arbiter of his own will and that Christ’s will is the same as the Father’s? When he said, ‘All that the Father has is mine,’¹⁷¹ without doubt, since nothing is excepted, the same will that the Father has is possessed by the Son. Accordingly there is one will where there is one operation; for in God the sequence of will is the effecting of the operation.¹⁷² But the will of man is other than the will of God. Furthermore – so that you should know that, while life is the object of the human will, since we fear death, Christ’s passion was the object of the divine will, that he should suffer for us – when Peter wanted to dissuade the Lord from the passion, the Lord said, ‘Your thoughts are not those of God but those of men.’¹⁷³ Therefore he assumed my will and assumed my distress. I mention distress boldly, since I am speaking of the cross. Mine is the will that he called his own, because as man he assumed my distress, as man he spoke, and therefore he said, ‘Not as I will but as you will.’¹⁷⁴ Mine is the distress that he assumed out of love for me, for no one rejoices when about to die. He suffers for me, he is distressed for me, he grieves for me. Therefore he grieved both for me and in me, since he had nothing in himself to grieve for. So you grieve, Lord Jesus, not at your wounds but at mine, not at your own death but at our weakness. As the prophet says, ‘He grieves for us, and we, Lord, thought that you were in grief,’¹⁷⁵ when in fact you were grieving not for yourself but for me.¹⁷⁶ What wonder, if he who wept for one grieved for all? What wonder, if when about to die he was weary on behalf of all, since he shed tears when about to raise

169 The passage down to this point reappears in a florilegium in Session V (p. 260, no. 4).

170 Mt 8:2.

171 Jn 16:15.

172 The preceding passage (from ‘When he said...’) reappears in the same florilegium in Session V (p. 308, no. 5).

173 Mt 16:23.

174 Mt 26:39.

175 Is 53:4.

176 In place of ‘when in fact ...’ the Greek version gives ‘but he was handed over on account of our sins’ (Cp. Is 53:5).





Lazarus?¹⁷⁷ On that occasion, indeed, he was moved by the tears of a devout sister, [89] because she touched his human mind, and here he operates with a deep love, so that, just as his death abolished death and 'his bruises healed our scars',¹⁷⁸ so his sorrow might take away our sorrow. As man, therefore, he is in doubt, as man he is troubled; strength is not troubled, his Godhead is not troubled, but his soul is troubled, the human weakness assumed is troubled. And therefore, because he assumed a soul, he also assumed the emotions of the soul, for he could not be troubled or moved in respect of being God. Finally he said, 'God, my God, why have you forsaken me?'¹⁷⁹ So he is speaking as man, undergoing my fears, since when in danger we think ourselves deserted by God. He is troubled as man, he weeps as man, he is crucified {as man}.¹⁸⁰ For the apostle Paul also said that they crucified the flesh of Christ,¹⁸¹ and in another place the apostle Peter says, 'Christ suffered in the flesh.'¹⁸² So the flesh suffered, while the Godhead is free of death; by the law of human nature the body yielded to suffering. Or can the Godhead truly die, when the soul can not? 'Do not fear,' he said, 'those who can kill the body but cannot kill the soul.'¹⁸³ Therefore if the soul cannot be killed, how can the Godhead?

5. Likewise, from the book of Saint Augustine bishop of Hippo against the Arians:¹⁸⁴

There is in man a certain likeness, even though it is in no way to be compared to the surpassing quality of that Trinity which is God, for the latter is God and the former is a creature. Nevertheless, it possesses something, though dissimilar, whereby that which is said about the ineffable nature of God can in some way or other be understood. For it was not to no purpose that scripture does not say, 'Let us make man in your image', as if the Father were speaking to the Son, or 'in my image', but what it says is 'in our image', which is correctly understood as spoken in the person of the

177 Cp. Jn 11:35.

178 Is 53:5.

179 Mt 27:46.

180 Supplied from the Greek, and Ambrose's original text.

181 The Greek version replaces Ambrose's loose reference by an exact citation of 2 Cor 13:4, 'Although he was crucified in weakness, he lives by the power of God.' But Ambrose was more probably thinking of 1 Cor 2:8, 'If they had recognized him, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.'

182 1 Pt 4:1.

183 Mt 10:28.

184 Augustine, *Contra sermonem Arianorum* 16, PL 42. 695.





Trinity itself. Let us therefore reflect on these three things in the mind of man – memory, understanding and will; everything we do is done by these three. And when these three are in a good and right state, everything we do is good and right, if neither forgetfulness deceives the memory, nor error the understanding, nor wickedness the will; in this way, indeed, we are remade in God's image. Every work of ours, therefore, is done by these three, for we do nothing that is not done by these three together. Moreover, when we speak of them singly, even what pertains to one of them is done by all. For memory does not perform on its own the speech that we make by memory alone, but understanding [91] and will cooperate in it, even though it pertains to memory alone. It is easy to perceive this in relation to the other two as well, for whatever intelligence utters from itself, it does not utter without memory and will, and whatever will says or writes from itself alone, it does not do without understanding and memory.

6. Likewise from the book of Saint Augustine on the grace of the New Testament to Honoratus.¹⁸⁵

O men, do not lose hope that you can become sons of God, because even the very Son of God, namely the Word of God, 'became flesh and dwelt among us'.¹⁸⁶ Repay him in turn and become spirit, and dwell in the one who became flesh and dwelt among us. For no longer is there no hope that by participating in the Word men can become sons of God, since the Son of God by participating in the flesh became a son of man. We, therefore, who are changeable and need to be changed for the better, are made to participate in the Word. But the Word, who is unchangeable and did not change at all for the worse, was made to participate in flesh, through the mediation of a rational soul. For neither did Christ the man, as the Apollinarian heretics supposed, either lack a soul or lack reason and will;¹⁸⁷ but scripture in its own way, in order to display Christ's humility all the more, lest it should appear to have avoided the word 'flesh' as something unworthy, used 'flesh' for 'man'. Nor is it the case that, because scripture says, 'All flesh will see the salvation of God',¹⁸⁸ we are not to understand 'souls' there.

185 *Ep.* 140. 4.11–12, CSEL 44, p. 163, 11–27. This passage reappears in a florilegium in Session V (pp. 321–2, §12).

186 Jn 1:14.

187 The explicit reference to a human will in Christ is an insertion in the authentic text of Augustine, which runs simply 'For neither did Christ the man ... either lack a soul or lack a rational one.' The same insertion is made in the citation of this passage in Session V.

188 Lk 3:6.





- 1.¹⁸⁹ Gulosus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Pupput:
I have signed this statement of our orthodox faith.
2. Probus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Thacia
Montana, as above.
3. Marcellus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of
Mattianensis, as above.
4. Pariator by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Hiltensis,
as above.
5. Theodore by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Biltha,
as above.
6. Mellosus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Gisipensis,
as above.
7. Constantine by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Tabbora,
as above.
8. Felix by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Pariensis, as
above.
9. Paul by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Thibica, as
above.
10. [93] Florentius by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of
Egugensis, as above.
11. Donatus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Hippo
Diarrhytus, as above.
12. Valerius by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Thubursicu,
as above.
13. Vitalis by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Zarnensis,
as above.
14. Crescis by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Cefalensis,
as above.
15. Augustalis by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of
Abitinae, as above.
16. Gentilis by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Clibdensis,
as above.
17. Crescens by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of
Thuburnica, as above.

189 The bishops now listed are all of the province of Proconsularis. The place-names are given in adjectival form; I give the substantival form when this is recoverable. For details of location (where known) and occurrence elsewhere see Maier (1973) and Mandouze (1982). The Greek MSS abridge the list, giving only the first three names.





178 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

18. Maximus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Rucuma, as above.

19. Victor by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of the municipality of Thucca,¹⁹⁰ as above.

20. John by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Cilibia, as above.

21. Boniface by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Telensis, as above.

22. Felix by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Timida, as above.

23. Fructuosus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Vina, as above.

24. Benenatus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Simitthu, as above.

25. Cyprian by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Tadduensis, as above.

26. Bassus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Carpi, as above.

27. Adeodatus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Abbir, as above.

28. Victor by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Membressa, as above.

29. Vitalis by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Thizica, as above.

30. Peter by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Culusitana, as above.

31. Januarius by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Libertinensis, as above.

32. Redemptus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Neapolis, as above.

33. Felix by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Aborensis, as above.

34. Pariator by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Scillium, as above.

35. Victor by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Bulnensis, as above.

190 Thucca (the modern Dougga) is a probable correction of the MSS 'Togia' (Maier [1973] 220).





36. Dominic by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Absassallensis, as above.

37. Stephen by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Thuccabor, as above.

38. Boniface by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Puppianensis, as above.

39. Valentinian by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Bisica, as above.

40. Germanus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of the city of Thuburbo,¹⁹¹ as above.

41. Fortunius by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Ofitana, as above.

42. Redemptus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of the municipality of Canapius, as above.

43. Cresciturus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Bossa, as above.

44. Reparatus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Megalopolis, as above.

45. Januarius by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Musti, as above.

46. Maximus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Sua, as above.

47. Julian by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Duae Selemselae, as above.

48. Donatianus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Numluli, as above.

49. Clarissimus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Thabraca, as above.

50. Constantine by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Althiburus, as above.

51. Lucian by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Succubensis, as above.

52. Cresconius by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Uccula, as above.

53. Candidus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Sicca, as above.

191 Either Thuburbo Maius or Thuburbo Minus.





180 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

54. Donatus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Horrea, as above.

55. Florentius by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Senta, as above.

56. [95] Quobulus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Caeciritana, as above.

57. Felix by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Trisepel, as above.

58. Benenatus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Giutrambaciensis,¹⁹² as above.

59. Stephen by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Clypea, as above.

60. Victorinus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Abziritana, as above.

61. Mellosus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Bulla [Regia], as above.

62. Cyprian by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Villa Magna, as above.

63. Navigius by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Thigimna, as above.

64. Tripolius by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Uchi [Maius], as above.

65. Benenatus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Naraggara, as above.

66. Flavian by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Utica, as above.

67. Benenatus by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Curubis, as above.

68. Fortis by the grace of God bishop of the holy church of Agensis, as above.

[94] Maximus the most holy bishop of the church of Aquileia said:¹⁹³

The synodical letter to Paul bishop of Constantinople from the God-beloved bishops of Africa that has now been read to us presents them clearly as having condemned his impious opinion and confirmed the pious

192 Maier (1973) 149 suggests that this may be a contraction of 'Giufi trans Bagrada'.

193 This speech is attributed to Maximus in the Latin version but to Pope Martin in the Greek. The Latin may well reflect a memory that it was Maximus, a less obvious speaker than Martin, who spoke at this point, even if not in the words given here.





doctrine of the holy fathers, by clearly defining that the one and the same Jesus Christ our Lord has two natures in unmixed and inseparable union and two natural wills and two natural operations, divine and human (or uncreated and created), and this not by accident or oversight, but as was fitting for wise priests and advocates of God and champions of the truth, namely on the basis of the cogent proofs (as you have seen) of the holy fathers – I mean of Ambrose and Augustine, the glorious and illustrious teachers of the catholic church. In consequence our opponents, who have not been converted to the better opinion from the worse, are at a loss for their defence, in view both of the citation of passages from the fathers and of the witness of synodical testimonies sent to them by all both orally and in writing, including that boldly presented by the orthodox priests in person for the correction of their aberration, which for so many years they have brandished in combat against the unimpeachable faith of us Christians. For they have refused to hearken to the voice of one chanting,¹⁹⁴ blocking the ears of their understanding and impelling their minds to a shameless and gross rejection, with the result that the statement by Wisdom on this subject applies also to them: ‘I called and you did not listen to me. I addressed words and you did not heed, but you made my counsels of no avail, and my reproaches you did not heed. For they hated wisdom and did not accept the word of the Lord, nor were they willing to heed my counsels, but they scorned my reproaches. Therefore they will eat the fruits of their way and be filled with their own impiety; but he who listens to me will abide in hope and rest without fear from every evil.’¹⁹⁵

[96] It is therefore necessary that this letter too (I am referring to the one written to Paul from the devout bishops of Africa) should be included in the minutes, to expose both him and the hostility and animosity like his that for so many years (as has already been said) they have exhibited against our orthodox faith, which is to say against God’s catholic and apostolic church, in order that they may derive no strength from their erroneous conceit, nor present without rebuke their innovation for the seduction of the more naive.

Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

I have a suggestion to make to your beatitude, who is well aware that the synodical letter of the one now presiding in the city of Carthage, I mean the most sacred Victor, is carefully preserved in safe keeping in

194 Cp. Ps 57:6.

195 Prov 1:24–33 (with omissions).





your apostolic archives, in which most appropriately he communicated his elevation to the priesthood to your all-holiness's predecessor Pope Theodore of apostolic memory. In this letter, after powerfully deploring and excoriating the outlandish innovation, he pleaded with your apostolic authority for its thorough condemnation for the sake of a firm vindication and safeguarding of orthodox doctrine. For this reason I have brought it, in case it is decided that together with the others this synodical letter should also be included (as is reasonable) in the proceedings by your beatitude.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

It is appropriate and indeed essential because of the dignity of his see, that is to say of his pious and orthodox beliefs, that the synodical letter of the God-beloved Victor bishop of Carthage should by all means be made known to us also, for the sake of a more complete knowledge of its purport concerning the doctrines of the catholic church.

Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

As you have ordered, I have brought the letter you mention and have it to hand, to satisfy your honour's good pleasure.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Let, as suggested, the synodical letter of the most God-beloved Victor bishop of the city of Carthage be duly received and read to the holy synod in session with us.

[98] And, taking it, Paschalis, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out:¹⁹⁶

[99] To his holy brother the most blessed and most honourable Pope Theodore from Victor.

The works acceptable to God and the glorious conduct of your most blessed fatherliness are known to virtually the whole world; and, therefore, while through apostolic preaching and doctrine the entire earth is full of the advocacy¹⁹⁷ of the faith, so through the teaching of the divine utterances

196 I translate the Latin version, which is the original.

197 This meaning of *cultura* is a Graecism, arising from the use of the word to translate





in the instruction of your exhortatory admonition the orthodox church of Christ is being built up, founded on apostolic ordinance and most firmly buttressed by the faithful fathers. To her all the most blessed apostles, endowed with an equal share of honour and authority, by pious and holy conversion of the hoards of the nations, led the men foreknown by the grace of divine predestination from darkness to light, from a fallen state to true faith, and from death to life, by means of salutary precepts and admonitions.

Your honourable brotherliness, fully matching the merits of these holy apostles and imitating their example to perfection, adorns the church of God with probity of character and holiness of conduct. Strong in the sacred faith and in Christian conduct, you ceaselessly perform and effect with pontifical zeal what you enjoin as pleasing to God, by observing the commandments of the divine law. For, as the apostle states, 'it is not the hearers of the law who are just before God, but it is the doers of the law who will be justified'.¹⁹⁸ Your holy and venerable integrity meditates on this divine law day and night, according to the scripture;¹⁹⁹ this meditation is observable not in a mere reading that follows the form of the letters, but, through the presence in you of Christ's abounding grace, is firmly instilled in your mind, while the holy law of Christ, God and Lord, never departs from your heart. As the prophet says in the psalm, 'The mouth of the just man will meditate wisdom and his tongue utters judgement.'²⁰⁰ 'The law of his God is in his heart',²⁰¹ 'not written in ink but by the Spirit of the living God in your hidden part, and neither on stone tablets but on the fleshly tablets of the heart', as we are taught by the letter of the most blessed apostle Paul to the Corinthians.²⁰²

[101] After this introduction, we inform your brotherliness, pleasing to God, that on the seventeenth day before the Kalends of August of the fourth indiction,²⁰³ through a prevenient gift of God's grace according to his decree and your holy prayers worthy of God, my lowliness received the consecration and vesture of episcopal honour in the holy church of the city

πρεσβεία. Cp. the use of *colo* to mean 'advocate, uphold' in the letter given above from the bishops of Proconsularis (ACO² I p. 83, 23).

198 Rom 2:13.

199 Ps 1:2.

200 Ps 48:4.

201 Ps 36:31.

202 2 Cor 3:3, 'in your hidden part' being an addition.

203 16 July 646, mistranslated in the Greek as '17 August'.





of Carthage. Commending ourselves to your prayers, holy and acceptable to God, we entreat that in this exalted dignity we may be guided by the almighty and most high God and, set free from evil actions, possess not merely the title but also the merit of the priesthood, protected by the succour of Christ our Lord and God, so that, fortified by the intercessions you pour out to God on our behalf and guided by your excellent instruction, we may receive, together with the whole of the Christian congregation entrusted to our charge, the privilege of being kept by divine protection safe from all harm.

To pay, therefore, our respects to your holy and honourable brotherliness, we have despatched in our place Mellosus, your humble {suppliant} and our brother bishop,²⁰⁴ Redemptus the deacon, and Cresciturus, notary of our holy see, your servants. We ask your beatitude to release them to us swiftly, so that, God willing, they may be able to return to their own churches before winter.

Above all I confess that here at the very beginning of our promotion our heart has received no slight wound, so as to long for what was expressed by the prophet: 'Who will give to my head water and to my eyes a fountain of tears, and I shall sit and weep day and night?'²⁰⁵ For behold, the churches of God are greatly troubled, and we cannot bear the cries and groans of the most Christian bishops who beseech and protest that the innovations and concocted inventions approved by our venerable fellow priest Paul in opposition to the most truthful faith (as it is reported) ought to be rejected. But we, treating the issue with moderation, have deemed it expedient to bear with patience the complaints of our most blessed fellow priests, even though they are utterly justified, and to transmit the matter with vigilant solicitude to the venerable hearing of your brotherliness. For they say that lately in the imperial city certain scrolls of writing, like epigrams, have been posted up in the sacred edifices that are clean contrary to the catholic religion, the true faith itself, and the traditions of the fathers. For who is so senseless as to dare to proclaim with sacrilegious voice that in our Lord Jesus Christ there is only one will or one operation, even though it is patently clear in the most explicit definitions of the fathers that in our Lord Jesus Christ there are found in every way two natures with their two wills and two operations and natural properties? We could prove the

204 The supplement is from the Greek. This Mellosus could be either that of Gisipensis or that of Bulla Regia (§§6 and 61 in the list above).

205 Jer 9:1.





contention of our insignificance with numerous instances from the fathers, were it not the case that we are convinced that your most holy brotherliness retains them totally and firmly in your memory. But so that we may be confirmed in everything by the decrees of the apostolic see, [103] we have inserted a pronouncement by your most blessed predecessor Leo of apostolic memory: it runs, 'Each nature in communion with the other performs²⁰⁶ what is proper to it.' We, therefore, following in all respects the decrees of the fathers, most firmly proclaim that in Christ our Lord there are two natures with their two wills and two operations, and we truthfully acknowledge him to be true God and true man (though without human offences),²⁰⁷ rejecting the sneers, inanities and mendacious follies of all the heresies.

It is therefore for you, most holy brother, to oppose with a canonical sentence, according to custom, that which is contrary to the catholic faith, and to prohibit novel utterance that lacks any sanction from the authority of the venerable fathers. For we, humble of heart and holding (through God's help) the correct beliefs, are bound to you in a single bond of love, in all respects staunchly defending the true faith and the catholic religion. Catholics should strive with great diligence to put up principled opposition to those unprincipled,²⁰⁸ lest, overcome by the torpor of sloth, we be found guilty of the offence of keeping silent and be condemned as if for showing them favour, by neglecting to reject what is contrary to the catholic faith. For it was said by the blessed Felix, the apostolic predecessor of your holiness, that 'to be negligent when you could confound the deviant is nothing other than to give them support, for one who abstains from opposing their manifest crime is not clear of the suspicion of a secret complicity.'²⁰⁹ Patent and manifest, most holy teacher, is the venomous, snakelike cunning (quite without candour) and crafty deceit of the heretics. For what is it to take away the properties of the natures in Christ our Lord, if not to introduce a fusion of the same natures, which is totally contrary to the catholic church, that is, to the decrees of the fathers of the holy council of Chalcedon, on

206 The word is *agit*, as in the original text of Leo's Tome. In citations where the Greek is the primary version this becomes *operatur* (as in the speech by Pope Martin that follows). See p. 333, n. 254 below.

207 This echoes the Chalcedonian Definition, 'Following, therefore, the holy fathers, we teach that the Son our Lord Jesus Christ is to be acknowledged ... as truly God and truly man ..., yet without sin.'

208 I imitate the play on words in the original – *inprobis probe resistere*.

209 Felix III, Letter to Acacius, in Theil (1868) 237.





which beyond any doubt depends in its fullness both the foundation of the faith and its crown.²¹⁰

We would also have written in similar vein to our same brother and fellow bishop Paul, the most blessed priest of the imperial city, were it not that we are aware that it has been alleged by the false statements of scoundrels that our province of Africa is committing certain offences which, in truth, are non-existent.²¹¹ Yet we add this to our request, that you give instructions that what has been written in epistolary form by our fellow bishops in our holy synod to the most blessed Patriarch Paul be transmitted to our same brother Paul by the *apocrisarii* of your beatitude.²¹²

{*The subscription.* May God almighty, grant us, my lord, the favour of finding you in good health and mindful of us, most holy brother.}²¹³

[104] Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

In his synodical letter that has just been read Victor the most devout bishop of Carthage has both made us aware of his ardent zeal and displayed his most becoming modesty – his zeal in boldly arraigning and accusing before our apostolic see the outlandish innovation and in using his letter to give us precise information about the protests of all Christians on its account and the continuous groans of the devout bishops, alarmed to no small degree (as he has written) by the inventions and concoctions that Bishop Paul of Constantinople has ratified in opposition to the true faith, and also his humility (as is appropriate) in not presuming hitherto to treat him as excommunicate but calling him 'fellow bishop' until such time as he may learn of the judgement passed on him by our apostolic authority,²¹⁴ which is to say that of Peter the head of the apostles, who alone, above all others, was deemed worthy to receive in trust from the King of kings, Christ God, the keys of the kingdom of heaven,²¹⁵ so as to open it deservedly for those whose belief in the Lord is orthodox and to close it to all the unorthodox heretics who persist in their heresy. The said most God-beloved bishop

210 The Greek expands as follows: 'in which is fully the foundation of our faith, and not only for the Romans but also for the whole of God's catholic and apostolic church.'

211 See n. 126 above.

212 This refers to the preceding document.

213 Supplied from the Greek version.

214 It was after receiving this and similar letters of support that Pope Theodore declared Paul excommunicate.

215 Cp. Mt 16:19.





has urged us in his letter to act accordingly, lest we should in any way ignore the just accusation brought against the heretics both by himself and his fellow ministers, but condemn with zeal everything that is manifestly opposed to the catholic faith and the true teaching of the fathers.

He says that {no one}²¹⁶ is so senseless as to dare to proclaim with sacrilegious voice that our Lord Jesus Christ has only one will or one operation, since it has conspicuously been made plain to all by the preaching of the fathers that the one and the same Christ God has two natures, two wills and two operations and natural properties in a union without either fusion or separation, and that this account of the matter can be confirmed in the Lord in multiple ways out of the very fathers of the catholic church. It is to us and our apostolic magisterium that he has entrusted this task, confident that in our heart we too maintain, hold and defend these [truths] as is right. No less has he hastened to confirm his pious belief by reference to the statements of the blessed Leo, who formerly presided over our apostolic see, and who said in writing, 'Each nature in communion with the other performs what is proper to it.' To this he adds the declaration, 'We, following in all respects the decrees of the holy fathers, properly profess two natures, from which and in which Christ exists in a union without fusion or separation, and uphold two wills and two operations, divine and human, since the same is true God and true man (apart from sin), [106] rejecting the sneers and lies of all the heresies and their vain follies,' since (he says) 'holding through God's guidance the correct beliefs, we are bound to you in a single bond of love, in all respects staunchly defending the catholic faith.'

At this point, accordingly, while piously presenting his own doctrines, he appeals, appropriately enough, to our canonical authority. This is why he has written, 'It is for you, most holy one, to oppose with a canonical sentence, according to custom, what is contrary to the catholic church and to prohibit anyone from uttering newly anything that has not been defined by the tradition of our holy fathers.' Accordingly he provides us with evidence of both his foreboding and his sincerity by saying, 'It is therefore necessary for the orthodox with great diligence to put up famous opposition to the infamous,²¹⁷ lest, overcome by the torpor of negligence, we fall into the sin of silence and be exposed as neglecting to reject what is contrary to the catholic faith, as if maintaining a degree of iniquitous goodwill towards

216 Supplied from the Latin.

217 I imitate the play on words in the Greek, τοῖς ἀδοκίμοις δοκίμως ἀντικαθίστασθαι, which itself imitates a similar play on words in Victor's original Latin (see n. 207 above).





it.' He confirms his account of the matter by a pious mention of Pope Felix of blessed memory, who sagely wrote that 'to be negligent when one could confound the deviant is nothing other than an adoption of their impiety, for one who abstains from resisting their manifest pollution is not clear of the accusation of a secret complicity with them.'²¹⁸ He therefore says that, since 'the villainy of the venomous serpents, namely the wickedness of the heretics,' has been demonstrated to all – 'the fact that by removing the natural properties of Christ they are fusing his natures' – it is wholly right that this should be condemned canonically, as not only in conflict with the definition of the holy council of Chalcedon but also in blatant opposition to all the holy fathers.

Now that this has been addressed to us in writing on behalf of the catholic church by both the other priests likewise and the aforesaid God-beloved bishop of the city of Carthage, it is not right for us to take our ease and procrastinate, lest we incur the charges mentioned by senselessly keeping silent over those who utterly refuse to return to the Lord from their most wicked innovation. 'I awaited the accomplishment of judgement,' as the blessed Isaiah says, 'but they have accomplished lawlessness, and not righteousness but a clamour'²¹⁹ that disturbs all the pious, although they 'know that God's judgement is according to truth against those who do such things'.²²⁰ I am referring to those who against the faith produce innovations and stumbling-blocks contrary to the teaching that we learnt from the saints, since indeed they 'despise the wealth of God's goodness, forbearance and patience, unaware that God's goodness is leading them to repentance, but in their hardness and impenitence of heart they are storing up for themselves wrath on the day of wrath and of the revelation of the righteous judgement of God, who will repay to each person according to his works', as the divine and great apostle Paul testifies.²²¹ It is therefore fitting that this letter as well be inserted in the guarantee of the minutes, to refute those who oppose a pious account of the faith.

[108] Let this now suffice for the apodictic charges concerning them, for as the divine apostle says, 'time will fail us'²²² if we were to choose to adduce those presented by virtually all the orthodox against their innovation, especially since these documents that have been read in our

218 Victor cited this passage at p. 185 above.

219 Is 5:7.

220 Rom 2:2.

221 Rom 2:4–6.

222 Heb 11:32.





THE SECOND SESSION

189

presence are sufficient to publish and make known to all their perverse heresy, which justly incurs censure and indictment. For ‘on the mouth of two or three witnesses will every allegation be sustained’, says the word that cannot lie,²²³ not to speak of a multitude of so many priests and congregations, hegumens and monks, who both orally and in writing decry this heresy of theirs, and send in abundance petitions on the matter to our apostolic see. But now the time has come for the writings of each of the persons under accusation to be brought before us and canonically examined, so that we may discern in sequence what in them dissents and differs from the profession of the definitions of fathers and councils, and so that we may with good reason make this known to everyone everywhere, for the protection of the catholic church. With God’s help we shall assuredly accomplish this in another session, since we have brought the present one to a close, within the parameters of those who have made accusations.

223 Mt 18:16 = Dt 19:15.





THE THIRD SESSION

SUMMARY¹

[114] The Third Act makes known the writings of the heretics under accusation, in which, rejecting the unimpeachable faith of us Christians, they concocted for themselves their own *Ekthesis* [exposition] of faith. By containing a refutation of this by the witness of scripture and the fathers,² it makes easily detectable by all who read it with understanding the perverse heresy of these men, which is hidden no longer by the screen of their deceptive logomachy.

INTRODUCTION

The third session of the synod took place on 17 October. It was taken up, as was the first part of the following session on 19 October, by a presentation of monoenergist or monothelete texts by the ‘heretics’, accompanied by a critical commentary. The length of the interval since the second session of 8 October must suggest that this documentation had not been fully prepared in advance of the synod.

The following texts were read out:

(1) [pp. 204–6] Theodore of Pharan (early seventh century), eleven brief excerpts,

(2) [pp. 212–13] Cyrus of Alexandria, the Seventh Chapter from the *Plerophoria* or *Pact of Union* (633),

(3) [pp. 213–16] Sergius of Constantinople, Second Letter to Cyrus of Alexandria (633),

¹ Taken from the Greek Acts.

² In fact, the Acts nowhere attempt a refutation of monotheletism on a purely scriptural basis, and the evidence from the Fathers is not deployed till Sessions IV and V.





- (4) [p. 219] Themistius of Alexandria (sixth century), five brief excerpts,
(5) [p. 224] Pyrrhus of Constantinople, excerpt from a dogmatic tome (after 634),
(6) [pp. 226–30] Emperor Heraclius, the *Ekthesis* (638),
(7) [pp. 231–2] Synod of Constantinople chaired by Sergius (638), confirmation of the *Ekthesis*,
(8) [pp. 233–4] Synod of Constantinople chaired by Pyrrhus (639),³ confirmation of the *Ekthesis*,
(9) [pp. 235–6] Cyrus of Alexandria, Third Letter to Sergius of Constantinople (638).

(1) Theodore of Pharan

Bishop Theodore of Pharan, on the Sinai peninsula, had been mentioned in the letter from Stephen of Dora read out at the previous session as the first exponent of monoenergism (p. 143), and for this reason is given pride of place here.⁴ He is mentioned by Maximus the Confessor as having been consulted by Sergius of Constantinople over the monoenergist and monothelete teaching contained in the famous Address to Pope Vigilius by Patriarch Menas of Constantinople.⁵ This suggests that priority in promoting monoenergism really belongs to Sergius of Constantinople, who is indeed called the first monothelete writer in the Acts of Constantinople III.⁶ The designation of either Theodore or Sergius as heresiarch served equally to discredit the doctrine as a recent innovation. The monoenergist treatise by Menas of Constantinople and the monoenergist professions of faith by Pope Vigilius, both dating back to the 540s, were ignored at the Lateran Synod and denounced as forgeries at Constantinople III.⁷

The eleven excerpts from Theodore's writings, although brief and selected by his opponents, suggest that, whatever we make of his insistence on monoenergist terminology, his view of Christ's operation(s) followed the

3 Certainly after 20 December 638, when Pyrrhus became patriarch (Winkelman 2001) 88).

4 For Theodore and his identification with the monk Theodore of Raithou, author of the extant *Praeparatio*, see Di Berardino (2006) 295.

5 Maximus, *Disputation with Pyrrhus*, PG 91. 332BC. The date cannot be later than 624 and may well be before 619; see Jankowiak (2009) 29.

6 ACO² II/2, p. 578, 23–4; p. 582, 20.

7 They were discussed at Sessions III and XIV of Constantinople III.





understanding common in his time to writers *monothelete* and *dyothelete* alike. He readily recognised the mediating role played by Christ's rational soul – doubtless in volition and understanding – but saw the initiating impulse as arising either from the Godhead or from the natural movements of the body (see §§1, 3 and especially 7), with the Godhead exercising overall control (§§2, 11).⁸ One may compare the *dyoenergist* champion Sophronius of Jerusalem, 'He did not undergo them [thirst, passion, and the rest] involuntarily or under compulsion, even if he acted with human movements ..., but did so when the same [God the Word] had willed to suffer, do, and operate humanly ..., and not when the physical and fleshly movements wished to be physically stirred into operation.'⁹

What, then, could the Lateran Synod find to use against Theodore? Pope Martin (in the speech ascribed to him here) devotes most of his fire (pp. 207–9) to Theodore's treatment of those moments in Christ's life when the weight and solidity of his body were suspended – when he came forth from his mother's womb without impairing her physical virginity (according to traditional doctrine), when he walked on water, when he rose from the tomb, and when (subsequently) he came to the disciples through locked doors (§10). Martin deduces that Theodore held that Christ 'was born in mere appearance and not in essence as man' (p. 208). What in fact Theodore was saying is the same as Sophronius in the passage just quoted: the Word of God incarnate submitted to human limitations not out of necessity but *when* he chose to do so, while at other times, in the working of miracles, his body took on divine powers and attributes as required.

(2-5) Ps.-Dionysius in Cyrus, Sergius, Themistius and Pyrrhus

There follows a sequence of texts best taken together, since all relate to the proper use of a disputed text – the passage of Dionysius of Athens (known today as Dionysius the Areopagite or Pseudo-Dionysius and dated to around 500) that attributes to Christ 'a new operation, the theandric' (*ep.* 4). In the sixth century Chalcedonians had argued with miaphysites as

⁸ It was the role of the Godhead as the directing principal that led Theodore to call the operation 'one and divine' (§§5, 8). The manhood had its role, but as less the co-partner than the 'instrument' (§11).

⁹ ACO² II/1, p. 450, 10–16. Sophronius must mean not that Christ's human impulses were brought about by direct divine causation but that the divine will could either allow them or suppress them.





to whether Cyril of Alexandria's favourite formula 'one incarnate nature of God the Word' asserted a single nature in Christ or rather the divine nature plus the flesh, hence two natures. So now, in the seventh, the two sides debated over whether Dionysius' formula of a 'theandric operation' (meaning an operation that was partly divine and partly human) was monoenergist or dyoenergist.

Debate started with the *Plerophoria* (or *Pact of Union*) issued in 633 by Cyrus Patriarch (or more strictly patriarchal *locum tenens*) of Alexandria as a profession of faith acceptable to both the Chalcedonians and a group of moderate miaphysites, dominant in Egypt, called the Theodosians (after a sixth-century miaphysite patriarch).¹⁰ The Seventh Chapter of this text (quoted here in full, p. 212) is in the main a summary of the interpretation of the Chalcedonian Definition that had been canonised at the Second Council of Constantinople (553): it warns against a misuse of Chalcedon's 'in two natures' formula, insists that the natures are distinct 'in perception alone' – that is, the Godhead and manhood of Christ are perceived to be different and distinct under analysis but exist as a single, united entity. This insistence on unity in Christ is then reinforced by the assertion that 'according to the sainted Dionysius' there is in Christ 'one theandric operation', performing both what is divine and what is human.

The text of Cyrus is followed in the Acts by a letter written by Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople, approving the doctrine of the *Assurance* and congratulating Cyrus on the reunion of the churches. But by the time this letter was written Sergius had been lobbied by a passionate opponent of monoenergism, Sophronius the Sophist, shortly to become patriarch of Jerusalem, and had come to see that the new agreement threatened schism within the Chalcedonian ranks. As a result, his reply to Cyrus contains a discreet corrective of his position, providing the following gloss to Cyrus' one theandric operation: 'Every divine and human operation proceeded from one and the same God the Word incarnate' (p. 214). The implication is that the unity of Christ's operation is best conveyed not by a monoenergist formula but by stressing the oneness of the agent. To bring out the force of 'every divine and human operation' Sergius added a citation from the Tome of Pope Leo that was anathema to the miaphysites: 'Each form operates in communion with the other.' Back in 626, when Cyrus himself had cited this sentence as evidence against monoenergism, Sergius

¹⁰ The full text of the *Plerophoria* comes in the Acts of Constantinople III (ACO² II/2, 594–600).





had replied that no orthodox writer had understood Leo as teaching two operations,¹¹ dyoenergism seemed to him to imply two separate operations, but he had no wish to deprive either the Godhead or the manhood of Christ of any of their activities or impulses. Most revealing of Sergius' stance at this date is his contemporaneous First Letter to Pope Honorius,¹² which defends Cyrus' use of a monoenergist formula as an appropriate 'economy' (or accommodation) to win over schismatics, but discourages talk of either one or two operations as likely to cause offence.

At this point in the proceedings of the Lateran Synod the original sentence from Dionysius was read out, none too soon: Christ 'did not perform divinely what is divine nor humanly what is human, but, since God had become man, exercised for us a new operation, the theandric' (p. 217). It is possible that the original text of Dionysius had 'one operation', but the seventh-century monotheletes were unable to adduce manuscript evidence, and Pyrrhus in a passage cited later in this session admitted that Cyrus had altered the text. But even the version given here excludes the notion of two separate operations in Christ, with (for example) the divine Word working miracles and the manhood dying on the cross; instead it speaks of a combined operation with both divine and human effects. The notion that both Godhead and manhood were active in all Christ's activities was indeed common property. Leo's affirmation that each of the natures acts 'in communion with the other' must not be overlooked, and he was to assert in a later document that the flesh does not act without the Word nor the Word without the flesh.¹³ The doctrine of the monoenergists was no different: as was later stated by their champion at Constantinople III, Macarius of Antioch, echoing Sergius, 'We believe that the miracles and the sufferings are of the same [person] and that, in a word, every divine and human operation proceeded from one and the same Christ our God, for he did not perform divinely what was divine nor humanly what was human, but after becoming man God the Word displayed a new theandric operation.'¹⁴

The Lateran Synod, however, ignored this basic agreement, and at this point in the proceedings the allegation is made that Cyrus had distorted

11 See the correspondence between Cyrus and Sergius in ACO² II/2, 588–92 and 528–30.

12 ACO² II/2, 534–46.

13 Leo, *ep.* 124.5, ACO II. 4, p. 161, 7–11. Similar statements occur in Maximus the Confessor (*ep.* 19, PG 91. 593A), Sophronius of Jerusalem (ACO² II/1, pp. 442, 14–446, 3) and Pope Martin himself (p. 148 below).

14 ACO² II/1, p. 222, 17–21.





Dionysius' teaching by a misquotation and that Sergius had gone one worse by defining 'one operation' in Christ without specifying that it is theandric – although in fact the phrase 'one operation' occurs in Sergius' letter simply as a loose citation of Cyrus and not as a formula proposed by Sergius himself. There follows the reading of a series of short excerpts from the sixth-century miaphysite theologian Themistius, as evidence that the formula 'one operation' was of miaphysite origin and therefore heretical (p. 219).¹⁵ Themistius had argued that Christ's human mind was not omniscient: he doubtless cited the gospel passages in which Christ sought information or declared that he did not know the day and the hour of the coming of the Son of Man (Mk 13:32).¹⁶ Theologians of the age of Ephesus I and Chalcedon had often been ready to accept limited knowledge in Christ's manhood, but by the sixth century this appeared to be Nestorian, as separating the two natures. Themistius had to lean over backwards to reassure his fellow miaphysites that he still regarded Christ as one person with one operation, which (following Dionysius) he was happy to call theandric. Martin (to whom all this analysis is ascribed in the Acts) concludes by arguing that Dionysius' 'theandric operation' meant the two operations, divine and human, acting in union, and neither the abolition of one of the operations nor the fusion of the two.

There follows a speech ascribed to Bishop Deusdedit of Cagliari, who cites a passage by Sergius' successor in the see of Constantinople, Pyrrhus, in which Pyrrhus acknowledged that Cyrus had altered Dionysius' wording but defended him for so doing, on the grounds that 'a new operation, the theandric' is clearly a single operation (p. 224). Deusdedit deduces that Pyrrhus intended not merely to unite but to abolish the two natural operations, and accuses him of adhesion to the miaphysite position of Themistius' great contemporary Severus of Antioch. Severus had indeed been a leading champion of the doctrine of one operation in Christ, but in the sense not of a suppression of either of the natural operations but of the control of both by God the Word.¹⁷ The doctrine of one operation in Christ, as upheld or tolerated in various degrees by Cyrus, Sergius and Pyrrhus, could only be represented as heretical through misrepresentation.

15 Further excerpts from Themistius and his opponent Colluthus were read out in Session V.

16 See Van Roey and Allen (1994) 5–15, and Sophronius of Jerusalem in ACO² II/1, 480–2.

17 See Grillmeier (1995) 162–73.





(6) The *Ekthesis*

As we have seen, however, Sergius, while commending Cyrus' monoenergism as an appropriate *oikonomia* or accommodation to win over the miaphysites, had at once responded to Cyrus' initiative by issuing a document (the *Psephos*) that discouraged monoenergism and dyoenergism alike. This position he reasserted in the next document to be read out at this session, the *Ekthesis* of the faith, composed by Sergius¹⁸ and issued by the emperor Heraclius probably in 636.¹⁹ The document offers a compendium of orthodoxy, beginning with a statement of Trinitarian doctrine and proceeding to a Christology derived from the emperor Justinian's edict *On the orthodox faith* of 551 and the dogmatic canons of the Second Council of Constantinople (553);²⁰ characteristic of the latter is the emphasis on God the Word incarnate as the one subject of all the attributes and actions of Christ, including both the miracles and the sufferings.

The document proceeds to argue that the expressions 'one operation' and 'two operations' are both to be avoided, not as heretical but as problematic and potentially shocking to pious ears. Monoenergism is criticised as follows: 'The expression *one operation*, even if it was used by some of the fathers, nevertheless alienates and upsets the hearing of some, who suppose that it leads to the abolition of the two natures united hypostatically in Christ our God' (p. 229). The orthodox fathers who had used the expression included Cyril of Alexandria and (in the sixth century) Menas of Constantinople, Pope Vigilius and the stylite saint Symeon the Younger.²¹ But the objection that this expression sat awkwardly with the doctrine of two natures had force, since it was a familiar philosophical axiom, going back to Aristotle, that each distinct nature has its own movement or operation.²² The *Ekthesis* proceeds immediately to the

18 At his trial in 655 Maximus the Confessor cited a letter from Heraclius to Pope John IV in which the emperor, while acknowledging that he had issued the *Ekthesis*, insisted that its composition was solely the work of Sergius: Allen and Neil (2002) 66.

19 The date normally given is 638, provided by Pope Martin in Session I (p. 118). But Jankowiak (2009) 155–8 argues plausibly that this date is that of a copy sent to the new pope Severinus in that year and that the document had been issued in 636, immediately after the Council of Cyprus.

20 Riedinger (1976) 20–7 shows that the first half of the *Ekthesis* is a paraphrase of Justinian's edict (tr. in Price (2009) I, 129–59), which itself formed the basis of the dogmatic canons of Constantinople II.

21 See the citations in the monothelete florilegium edited and translated in Brock (1985).

22 See Chadwick (1981) 191–2.





similar problems that attend the expression ‘two operations’. First, ‘it was not used by any of the holy approved enlighteners of the Church’: the claim was too absolute, but it was true that the expression had never been widely used.²³ Secondly, the notion of two operations, when applied to two rational natures as in Christ, implies two wills, and this would set up a conflict of wills within the one Christ, while in fact (as the document proceeds to affirm) there is clearly but one will in Christ. The rejection in the *Psephos* of ‘two contrary wills’ in Christ had virtually implied this,²⁴ but the explicit statement of monotheletism that we find here was new.

The *Ekthesis* has generally been interpreted as an attempt to elevate the doctrine of one will in Christ into a formal dogma of the Church. Here, it has been argued, the monotheletes went beyond a pragmatic consideration of what doctrinal statement could unite the churches and thereby acted *ultra vires*; here was their ‘fundamental error’.²⁵ But there are several reasons for doubting this interpretation of the document:

(1) The heading of the Latin version, which offers an early and official interpretation of the document, describes it as issued ‘on account of the dispute raised by some on the question of operation’ and as universally accepted for ‘bringing peace to the holy churches of God’. Likewise, the decree of the Synod of Constantinople that proceeded to ratify the document imposed penalties on those who continued to promote either monoenergism or dyoenergism. Neither the heading nor this decree mentions monotheletism.

(2) The sentence that affirms one will in Christ continues with the words ‘since at no time did his flesh with its intellectual soul make its natural movement separately and of its own impulse in opposition to the bidding of God the Word ... , but when, how, and to the extent that God the Word himself resolved’ (p. 229). Sophronius of Jerusalem had said the same in a passage of his *Synodical Letter* that we have already had reason to quote: ‘He did not undergo them [thirst, passion, and the rest] involuntarily or under compulsion, even if he acted with human movements ... , but

23 A florilegium in the acts of Session V cites affirmation of two operations in three sixth-century writers (pp. 343–4, §§33–5).

24 The extant Greek text of Sergius’ First Letter to Pope Honorius, on which we depend for our knowledge of the *Psephos*, asserts the impossibility of ‘two wills’ coexisting in the same subject, but the Latin version shows this should be ‘two contrary wills’ (ACO² II/2, p. 542, 1). In any case ‘two wills’ meant ‘two contrary wills’ for Sergius, since he would have counted two concordant wills as a single will.

25 This phrase is from Ohme (2008a) 336.





did so when the same [God the Word] had willed to suffer, do, and operate humanly ..., and not when the physical and fleshly movements wished to be physically stirred into operation.²⁶ Nor did Pope Martin disagree: 'He allowed these wholly blameless emotions to be excited in him according to his will' (p. 372 below). Clearly there was general agreement that, while the manhood had its own 'natural movement' of impulse and desire, the Godhead maintained overall control. This sentence in the *Ekthesis* does not give the impression that its author thought his assertion of one will in Christ was saying anything novel.

(3) The assertion of monothelitism is not introduced with a blowing of trumpets, as if it were the main purpose of the document, but as part of an argument against dyoenergism. The doctrine is stated as self-evident, in view of the impossibility of the presence in Christ of two opposing wills. Here it is following the letter that Pope Honorius had written to Sergius in 633/4, which, famously, slipped into monothelitism without any sense that this was a momentous step.²⁷ Sergius is likely to have supposed that his own assertion of monothelitism was equally uncontroversial.²⁸

In all, an attentive reading of the *Ekthesis* in its original context reveals that the purpose of the document was simply to suppress the debate over one or two operations in Christ – a debate that the *Psephos* of 634 had already tried to quell but which Sophronius' *Synodical Letter* had re-ignited. The affirmation of one will in Christ was significant but incidental, and Sergius, misled by Honorius' letter, was not aware that it would itself be contested.²⁹

(7–9) Documents in support of the *Ekthesis*

There now followed the reading of three documents that expressed approval of the *Ekthesis*: extracts from the Acts of the Synod of Constantinople of 638 held under the chairmanship of Patriarch Sergius, extracts from a speech delivered at a subsequent synod by Sergius' successor Pyrrhus, and finally a letter to Sergius from Cyrus of Alexandria. These documents

26 ACO² II/1, p. 450, 10–16. Sophronius calls God the Word the *πρότανις* (governor) of the human sufferings and actions (p. 452, 4–5). See Hovorun (2008) 138–41.

27 ACO² II/1, p. 550, 16.

28 Note that the issue of one or two wills in Christ had received no mention at all in Sophronius of Jerusalem's long and aggressively dyoenergist *Synodical Letter*.

29 This reading of the *Ekthesis* finds further support in a report by Maximus the Confessor in 639, which does not interpret the document as asserting one will in Christ, PL 129, 586B.





were read in order to justify a condemnation of Sergius, Pyrrhus and Cyrus.

The extracts from the Acts of Sergius' synod record the assembled bishops approving the *Ekthesis* by acclamation. The final extract is a decree of deposition for clerics, and of excommunication for monks or laymen, who ignored the ban on teaching either one or two operations in Christ. These were the standard penalties for serious infringements of canon law or conciliar degrees, and did not necessarily imply a charge of heresy; indeed, how could *both* monoenergism and dyoenergism be heretical? That the penalty was imposed by a council rather than by the emperor in the *Ekthesis* itself follows the precedent of the condemnation of the Three Chapters under Justinian: penalties for non-compliance were laid down not by the emperor in his edict of 551 but by the Council of Constantinople of 553.³⁰

The speech by Pyrrhus at a subsequent synod of Constantinople likewise threatened the non-compliant with excommunication, and announced the dispatch of its Acts to absent bishops, so that the whole episcopacy could subscribe to the *Ekthesis*. Likewise, after the council of 553 the Acts were circulated round the provinces and bishops who failed to sign were threatened with deposition.³¹

Finally, the letter from Cyrus to Sergius greets the *Ekthesis* with feigned enthusiasm. Doubtless Cyrus did not publish the document in Alexandria, where its prohibition of monoenergist teaching would have undermined the union of 633.

This third session of the Lateran Synod concluded with a brief speech ascribed to Pope Martin, mentioning that the Roman see, unlike those of Constantinople and Alexandria, had condemned the *Ekthesis*. Martin had no reason to mention that the Roman reaction had been delayed by embarrassment over the stance of the recently deceased Pope Honorius, who in his First Letter to Sergius had given his support to monothelitism. Finally, in 641, the new pope John IV (640–2) composed an *Apologia pro Honorio papa* which interpreted Honorius' 'one will' in Christ as simply an affirmation of the indefectibility of his human will;³² at the same time he held a synod that condemned monothelitism.³³

³⁰ Price (2009) II, 126.

³¹ Price (2009) I, 33.

³² In his *Disputation with Pyrrhus* Maximus interpreted Honorius in the same way, PG 91. 328C–329A.

³³ See Caspar (1933) 537–42 and Winkelmann (2001) 97–8.





TEXT

[111]³⁴ In the name of our Lord, God and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the ninth year of the reign of our master Constantine the most pious Augustus, sixteen days before the Kalends of November in the eighth indiction,³⁵ there presided Martin the holy and most blessed pope of the holy apostolic see of the city of Rome, with the sacrosanct and venerable gospels lying displayed, in the church of our Lord, God and Saviour Jesus Christ that is called the Constantinian, and there were also seated to conduct the hearing equally with him the venerable men (2) Maximus the most holy bishop of Aquileia, (3) Deusdedit the most holy bishop of Cagliari, (4) Maurus bishop of Cesena and the presbyter Deusdedit, the representatives of Maurus the most holy bishop of the church of Ravenna, (5) Sergius bishop of Tempesa, (6) Reparatus bishop of Manturia, (7) Epiphanius bishop of Albanum, (8) Benedict bishop of Ajaccio, (9) Julian bishop of Horta, (10) Papinius bishop of Vibo, (11) Maximus bishop of Pisaurum, (12) Lucian bishop of Leontium, (13) Viator bishop of Ortona, (14) Bonitus bishop of Formiae, (15) Majorianus bishop of Palestrina, (16) Germanus bishop of Numana, (17) Laurence bishop of Perusium, (18) Carosus bishop of Falerii, (19) Marcianus bishop of Mevania, (20) Barbatus bishop of Sutrium, (21) Calumniosus bishop of Halaesa, (22) Peregrinus bishop of Messina, (23) Romanus bishop of Cerillae, (24) Crescentius bishop of Locri, (25) Felix bishop of Agrigentum, (26) Marcellinus bishop of Clusium, (27) Geminianus bishop of Volaterrae, (28) Marinianus bishop of Populonia, (29) Luminosus bishop of Tifernum Tiberinum, (30) Potentinus bishop of Velitrae, (31) Maurus bishop of Tuscania, (32) Martin bishop of Gabii, (33) Adeodatus bishop of Spoleto, (34) John bishop of Paestum, (35) Gaudiosus bishop of Reate, (36) [113] Laurence bishop of Tauriana, (37) John bishop of Tropeia, (38) Luminosus bishop of Salernum, (39) Sabbatius bishop of Buxentum, (40) John bishop of Tarentum, (41) Rufinus bishop of Sipontum, (42) Adeodatus bishop of Ameria, (43) Gaudiosus bishop of Capua, (44) Bonitus bishop of Ferentia, (45) Maurus bishop of Senegallica, (46) Maurosus bishop of Ancona, (47) Bonus bishop of Ficuculae, (48) Fortunatus bishop of Auximum, (49) Thomas bishop of Lunae, (50) Bonitus bishop of Ferentum Polymartium, (51) Maximus

³⁴ This introduction and list of bishops comes only in the Latin version. The list is identical to those of the other sessions and derives from the subscription list to the synodal canons (pp. 384–7 below).

³⁵ 17 October 649.





bishop of Trecalae, (52) Paschalis bishop of Blanda [Julia], (53) Luminosus bishop of the Marsi, (54) Gloriosus bishop of Camerinum, (55) Decoratus bishop of Tibur, (56) Amabilis bishop of Ostia, (57) Albinus bishop of Portus, (58) Palumbus bishop of Fundi, (59) Theodosius bishop of Croton, (60) Scholasticus bishop of Fanum, (61) Helias bishop of Lilybaeum, (62) Aquilinus bishop of Assisium, (63) Eusebius bishop of Atella, (64) Martin bishop of Centumcellae, (65) Juventinus bishop of Stabiae, (66) Maurus bishop of Senae, (67) Laetus bishop of Luca, (68) Theodore bishop of Rosellae, (69) Andrew bishop of Ydruntum, (70) Justus bishop of Tauromenium, (71) Felix bishop of Panormus, (72) Laurence bishop of Tuder, (73) John bishop of Carinae, (74) Albinus bishop of Signia, (75) Augustine bishop of Squillacium, (76) John bishop of Regium, (77) Barbatus bishop of Cumae, (78) Felix bishop of Terracina, (79) Oportunus bishop of Anagnia, (80) Firminus bishop of Blera, (81) **[115]** Jovian bishop of Firmum, (82) Anastasius bishop of Narnia, (83) Theodore bishop of Tyndaris, (84) Sapienius bishop of Nomentum, (85) Maximus bishop of Misenum, (86) Gratosus bishop of Nepet, (87) Leontius bishop of Naples, (88) Paschalis bishop of Thermae [Himeriae], (89) Oportunus bishop of Pisae, (90) Donatus bishop of Mariana, (91) Bonosus bishop of Aleria, (92) Peregrinus bishop of Lipara, (93) Boethius bishop of [Forum] Corneli, (94) Valentinus bishop of Thurii, (95) Luminosus bishop of Bononia, (96) Crescentius bishop of [Forum] Livii, (97) Stephen bishop of [Forum] Popilii, (98) Callionistus bishop of Hatria, (99) John bishop of Vicosabinae, (100) Potentius bishop of Pola, (101) Leontius bishop of Faventia, (102) Donatus bishop of Sassina, (103) John bishop of the Unnogours, (104) Stephen bishop of Dora, (105) John bishop of Gabopolis, and (106) Victorinus bishop of Uzalis.

[116] Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

‘For the sake of Sion I shall not remain silent and for the sake of Jerusalem I shall not rest,’ says the sacred Isaiah, ‘until my justice comes to the light and my salvation burns like a lamp.’³⁶ The catholic church, which is the true Sion and the city of Christ the heavenly king, has been assailed for so many years by those who oppose the word of the faith and ‘neither fear God nor respect man’,³⁷ but annul the excellent and canonical

³⁶ Is 62:1.

³⁷ Lk 18:2.





exhortations on this subject, even though so many people have addressed these to them orally or in writing and have adjured them to correct their stance and abandon their heresy, as was clearly proved in the previous session by the petitions and appeals of the God-beloved bishops and hegumens, while the apostle charges us, 'After a first and second warning reject a man who is heretical,³⁸ knowing that such a man is perverted and sins, being self-condemned.'³⁹ Therefore we should not, as has already been said, remain silent and at rest, lest we be condemned as lawless for being at peace in the peace that is hateful to God, since scripture says, 'I was zealous against the lawless, beholding the peace of sinners,'⁴⁰ and lest there apply to us as well the saying, 'Its priests have rejected my law and profaned my sanctuary; between profane and holy they did not distinguish, and between unclean and clean they did not distinguish'.⁴¹ Instead we ought to rise up with God and eagerly stand at his side, decked in the panoply of the Spirit against those who do evil to his faith, so that we may wisely 'test the spirits' (meaning their words) 'if they are from God'.⁴² For it is written in Jeremiah, 'I have given you as a tester among tested peoples, and you will know [me] as I test their way.'⁴³ For we need great persistence and nothing but the wise discernment that comes from the Lord, who reveals the secrets of the dark, to test and assay such people, since evil, being clandestine and hard to detect, can somehow conceal itself and slip away, through craftily simulating piety in order to avoid recognition by those investigating. Being aware of this, the great apostle said, 'Such people are false apostles, deceitful workmen, disguising themselves as apostles of Christ, and no wonder, for even Satan disguises himself as an angel of light. So it is no great thing if his servants also disguise themselves as servants of righteousness; their end will correspond to their works.'⁴⁴ But the Lord himself warned us again about this when he said, 'Beware of the false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing but within are ravenous wolves; you will know them by their fruits.'⁴⁵ First of all, therefore, offer petition to him on this matter from your whole heart, and say with David,

38 αἰρετικὸν, meaning in its original context 'quarrelsome'.

39 Tit 3:10–11.

40 Ps 72:3.

41 Ezek 22:26.

42 1 Jn 4:1.

43 Jer 6:27.

44 2 Cor 11:13–15.

45 Mt 7:15–16.





‘Unveil my eyes, and I shall perceive your wonders from your law, for your law is a lamp for my feet and a light for my paths,’⁴⁶ ‘because from him’, as Daniel says, ‘are wisdom and understanding, and he gives wisdom to the wise and prudence to those who possess understanding; he reveals the deep and hidden, discerning what is in darkness, and light is with him, because you have given me wisdom and power, and made known to me what I besought from you.’⁴⁷

[118] Come, therefore, and let us with God’s help examine the writings of each of the persons accused by us of innovation, with those, of course, who see to the minutes presenting them in turn.

Sergius the God-beloved bishop of Tempsa said:⁴⁸

In accordance with your apostolic declaration all of us seated here are ready (with God’s favour) for an examination of these matters. So if it seems good to your beatitude, let the writings of Theodore who was bishop of Pharan be shown to us first, since, as you know, most blessed one, Stephen the most sacred bishop of Dora declared in his own petition (as is known to all) that it was Theodore in his perverse writings who initiated this novel doctrine. It is therefore necessary, if it is pleasing to your beatitude, that we observe in this matter, together with strictness, the due order of proceedings.

All the most holy bishops said:

Most appropriately has Sergius, our God-beloved fellow bishop, requested that the writing of Theodore bishop of Pharan be brought to our knowledge first of all. For thereby will the teaching of those to follow be fittingly examined in order and sequence, with no confusion arising in the proceedings through the substitution of other writings.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God’s holy catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

According to the request of the holy synod here present, let the book of Theodore bishop of Pharan be presented by those who are devoutly assisting the proceedings.

46 Ps 118:18+105.

47 Dan 2:20–22, 23b.

48 It is Sergius of Tempsa who, later in this session (p. 216), requests that a key passage of Ps.-Dionysius be read out.





Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

According to the command of your beatitude I have brought the book of Theodore the former bishop of Pharan, and I have it to hand for your good pleasure.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Let the book of Theodore bishop of Pharan be received and read, as regards (of course) those passages included in it and marked,⁴⁹ in which he presents his confession about the dispensation of Christ our great God and Saviour.

[120] And, taking it, Theodore, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out, translated from Greek into Latin:

1. Theodore, bishop of Pharan, from the treatise he addressed to Sergius bishop of Arsinoe⁵⁰ in the province of Egypt:⁵¹ 'Everything that the Lord is recorded as having said or done he said and performed through mind, perception and the senses. Therefore everything is to be called one operation, ascribed to him as one and complete – Word,⁵² mind and the perceptive and organic body.'

2. The same from the same treatise: 'Since of his own initiative, in a divine and most wise dispensation, he took on sleep, weariness, hunger and thirst, whenever he wanted, we are most certainly right to attribute to the omnipotent and omniscient operation of the Word both the movement and the rest these involved, and therefore we profess one operation of one and the same Christ.'

3. The same from the same treatise: 'Sufficiently, I think, has the argument shown us through investigation that everything that is recorded of Christ the Master, whether of his Godhead or soul or body or both together (I mean soul and body) was worked singly and inseparably, beginning and

49 Since the Acts of Constantinople III contain an identical anthology of passages (ACO² II/2, pp. 602–6), the claim made here that the document being read was a fuller collection of material than what was read out is probably false; it was presumably motivated by a sense that Theodore was being condemned on a very slight textual basis.

50 Sergius of Arsinoe is mentioned in Maximus the Confessor's *Disputation with Pyrrhus* as the contact through whom Sergius of Constantinople wrote to Theodore of Pharan, sending Menas of Constantinople's address on one operation and will in Christ, and asking for his opinion (PG 91. 332BC).

51 See Winkelmann (2001) 50–1, no. 8.

52 That is, Christ's Godhead.





(so to say) flowing from the wisdom, goodness and power of the Word, and proceeding via the mediation of the rational soul and body. And therefore all these things are and have been called one operation of the totality of one and the same our Saviour.'

4. The same from the same treatise: 'So as a result of this we grasp plainly that everything we hear and believe about Christ is the work of the Godhead, whether fitting the divine nature or the human nature as well, and therefore these things are piously termed one operation of his Godhead and manhood.'

5. The same from the same treatise: 'As a result, the whole of the incarnation from start to finish and all its aspects both small and great are truly one most exalted and divine operation.'

6. [122] The same from the treatise he composed on the interpretation of patristic passages: 'The divine will that is Christ's, for his will is one, and that divine.'

7. The same from the same treatise: 'So from this without any doubt we learn that everything in the salvific dispensation, whether divine or human, is narrated of Christ our Saviour. He would initially take the impulse and cause (so to speak) from the Godhead, and was served by the body via the mediation of the intelligent and rational soul, whether you are speaking of a miraculous act of power or some natural movement of the manhood, such as desire for food, sleep, weariness, taking on toils, distress and affliction, which are called "passions" according to the customary use of these words. But they belong properly to natural movement arising from the ensouled and perceptive living organism, while those things that properly are, and are called, passions – the cross, the dying, the stripes, the wounds, the nailing, the spitting, the blows – all these would correctly and rightly be called one operation of the same one Christ.'

8. The same from the same treatise: 'Let us therefore consider everything whatsoever to do with the incarnation of Christ the Saviour one divine and truly salvific operation.'

9.⁵³ The same from the same treatise: 'On the basis of all these and similar instances, all the properties of the incarnation are well and most aptly to be believed and affirmed to be one operation of the Godhead.'

10. The same from the same treatise: 'By nature our soul is not of such power as to expel the natural properties of the body from the body or

53 Though omitted in our Greek MSS, this is to be found in both the Latin version and the parallel passage in the Acts of Constantinople III (ACO² II/2, p. 604, 22–4).





itself, and the rational soul is not perceived to be so in control of its own body as ever to prevail over the bulk, flux and colour of things bodily and connatural with the body, and make it at any time shed these properties, and yet in the dispensation of Christ our Saviour all this is attributed, and actually happened, to the divine and life-giving body; for without bulk and (so to say) bodilessly he came forth, without causing any separation, from the womb and the sepulchre and through doors,⁵⁴ and walked on the sea as on a floor.⁵⁵

11. [124] The same from the same treatise: ‘We must therefore believe and affirm that everything recorded of Christ the Saviour in relation to the incarnation is to be recognised to be one operation, of which God the Word is the craftsman and fashioner, while the manhood is the instrument. Everything that is said of him whether as God or whether humanly is the operation of the Godhead of the Word.’

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God’s holy catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

In Proverbs it is written, ‘Pride precedes ruin, and malice precedes a fall, for the malicious man will be punished, while if he causes injury, he will even add his soul.’⁵⁶ From the reading of his writings we find that this is what happened in the case of Theodore bishop of Pharan, who foolishly supposed that his own preconceptions were orthodox, although they were the product of self-willed error and not of the authoritative teaching of the fathers. For ‘the ways of a fool are straight before him’, as scripture says,⁵⁷ and ‘there are ways that appear straight to a man, but their end looks into the pit of Hades’.⁵⁸ Therefore, just as ‘grass on buildings {withers}⁵⁹ even before it is pulled out’⁶⁰ (through weeding by others), so he himself in his writings showed his ways to be without roots and withered, since the refutation of his piety comes not from another source but from within. For in every way, by defining that there is but one operation of the Godhead and the manhood of Christ, as you have heard, most God-beloved brethren, he professed that it is created, like something fashioned, through asserting

54 Jn 20:19, 26.

55 Mt 14:25–6 and parallels.

56 Prov 16:18, 19:19.

57 Prov 12:15.

58 Prov 16:25.

59 Supplied from the Latin version.

60 Ps 128:6.





in writing, 'Everything recorded of Christ the Saviour in relation to the incarnation must be recognised as one operation, of which God the Word is the craftsman and fashioner.' If accordingly God the Word is its craftsman and fashioner, as he declared, manifestly it is created, according to him, for everything brought into being by the Word through fashioning is created. And if he defines that Christ's operation is created, it is clear that, with the impious Arius and Nestorius, he is a creature-worshipper, since with them and like them he defines Christ to be purely created, and does not, like us, define him to be also uncreated: that is, he does not define him as both God by nature and man by nature but as mere man alone, for one who does not exercise an uncreated operation by nature cannot be uncreated by nature.

In this way he demonstrated by his own statements that his doctrine is worthless, and that in him is fulfilled the scripture, 'Transgressions ensnare a man, and each is bound by the fetters of his own offences; he perishes with the ignorant,'⁶¹ namely those who by [teaching] division and mere conjunction have blasphemed against the mystery of Christ God – and not [126] only with these but also with those who uphold the monstrous absurdity that this happened only in appearance – I am referring to Mani and the heretics Apollinarius and Severus.⁶² This is through his again asserting in his writings (as we have heard), 'By nature our soul is not of such power as to expel the natural properties of the body from the body or itself, and the rational soul is not perceived to be so in control of its own body as ever to prevail over the bulk, flux and colour of things bodily and connatural with the body, and make it at any time shed these properties, and yet in the dispensation of Christ our Saviour all this is attributed, and actually happened, to the divine and life-giving body; for without bulk and (so to say) bodilessly he came forth, without causing any separation, from the womb and the tomb and through doors, and walked on the sea as on a floor.'⁶³

For it is clear that by these words he completely abolishes both the body of the Lord with its intellectual soul and its natural properties, if indeed 'he made it shed these properties', as he states, and expelled them from himself, as he has written. For if indeed 'without bulk and bodilessly he came forth

61 Prov 5:22–3.

62 Severus of Antioch (d. 538) was the chief miaphysite theologian, while Mani and Apollinarius were the alleged progenitors of his doctrine. All were accused of denying Christ a real and complete human nature.

63 Passage 10 above.





from the womb' and as he walked trod 'on the backs of the sea',⁶⁴ then his walking and advancing was a mere illusion and not God incarnate in essence; nor again was the growth from the Virgin a miracle, and nor was God the Word incarnate's walking on the sea a matter for astonishment. For what is miraculous about advancing and walking bodilessly and without any bulk, or in not destroying virginity by coming forth, nor sinking in the water through walking upon it? For in neither case would bodilessness be miraculous, since it would be natural and not supernatural; for that which is bodiless and without bulk cannot by nature either destroy virginity or to sink in water, since it has no dimension at all, that is, length, breadth and depth. It is therefore patent and undeniable that he was of the opinion that God incarnate came forth from the womb and walked on the water without a body, fleshless and bodiless, for 'coming forth bodilessly' is properly coming forth without a body, just as coming forth seedlessly is coming forth without seed.

Since, therefore, he abolishes the body of the Lord with its intellectual soul and its natural properties, he is teaching that he was born in mere appearance and not in essence as a man. Again, what difference does he recognise between the birth of the same according to nature from God the Father and from the Virgin Mother? For if he says that the Lord was born bodilessly from both, it is clear that he holds his birth to be one and the same from both; and if he holds the birth to be one and the same from both, he must of necessity either profess that God the Word is incarnate from the Father just as from the Virgin or assert that he is not incarnate from the Virgin any more than from the Father, seeing that according to him he was born of her bodilessly, and he must acknowledge that on account of the same and identical birth he came forth by nature from both in the same way, whether with flesh or without it. It follows that he must either describe God the Father as created, as if [128] in respect of essence he provided his own Word from his own nature with flesh and intellectual soul for union, or hold that the Virgin was in no way the mother of the Word, as if in respect of essence she did not give birth to him incarnate from herself, but he passed through her bodilessly like a channel, in accordance with the heresy of Apollinarius.

Since, therefore, as has already been said, he abolishes the body and the natural properties of the body in the case of the mystery of Christ God, through defining that this was without bulk, flux or colour (as he says) and

⁶⁴ Cp. Num 34:11.





that the Lord came forth bodilessly from the womb (as he mythologises), what need have we still of witness from the fathers in order to rebut this heresy, which is plain and obvious to all from the writings of his that have just been read, unless perchance we need to adduce them for a complete refutation of him and his absurd ideas, since statements by the fathers provide a full refutation of someone wishing to refute them by his own words?

Come, therefore, and let us do this summarily by a comparison between his doctrines and the teachings of the church, contrasting them in sequence.

1. Theodore at one time bishop of Pharan spoke as follows: ‘The Lord came forth bodilessly from the womb.’

Cyril the renowned bishop of Alexandria says that the Lord was born in flesh from the Virgin; for in the first of the Twelve Chapters that he composed in his synodical letter to Nestorius he speaks as follows: ‘If anyone does not acknowledge that Emmanuel is in truth God and that therefore the holy Virgin is Mother of God (for she gave fleshly birth to the Word from God made flesh), let him be anathema.’⁶⁵

Moreover Gregory the Theologian, writing to Cledonius, speaks as follows: ‘If anyone says that the Lord passed through the Virgin as a channel but was not formed in her both divinely and humanly (divinely since without a husband, and humanly by the law of conception), he likewise is godless.’⁶⁶

2. Theodore bishop of Pharan said that the Lord did not have bodily bulk according to the flesh but walked on the sea without bulk and bodilessly.

The inspired Dionysius declares that he had fleshly bulk and bodily weight. And that he walked on the water with bulk and weight, and yet without getting wet, he teaches in his Treatise on the Divine Names as follows: ‘We do not know how he was formed from virginal blood by another bond contrary to nature, and how with unwetted feet that possessed bodily bulk and material weight he made his way on the wet and unstable element.’⁶⁷

[130] And in his letter to Gaius: ‘He performed what pertains to man in a manner surpassing man; this is shown by the Virgin’s supernatural conception and by the unstable water’s bearing the weight of material and

⁶⁵ The complete text of the Twelve Chapters (from Cyril’s Third Letter to Nestorius) is given below, pp. 269–71.

⁶⁶ Gregory Nazianzen, *ep.* 101.16, in *Lettres Théologiques*, SC 208, 42.

⁶⁷ Ps.-Dionysius, *On the divine names* 2.9, in *Corpus Dionysiacum*, I, p. 133, 8–11.





earthly feet and not giving way but through supernatural power remaining undiffused.⁶⁸

3. Theodore bishop of Pharan said that the Lord made his own body without the flux and colour of things bodily and connatural with the body.

Saint Basil says that the Lord experienced not only bodily flux from tears but also the passage and consumption of nourishment both solid and liquid and the stretching of the muscles by locomotion, when he teaches in his sermon on the eucharist: 'Therefore just as the Lord underwent hunger when solid nourishment had passed through him and submitted to thirst when the moisture in his body was consumed, so too he grew weary when his muscles and nerves were stretched by locomotion; this was not through the Godhead being exhausted by toil, but by the body undergoing the occurrences that result from nature. So too he underwent tears, allowing the flesh to experience natural occurrences.'⁶⁹

4. Theodore bishop of Pharan said that the Lord, as man, was without the natural properties of the body and expelled these natural properties from himself.

The holy and ecumenical council at Chalcedon issued the following definition: 'The difference of the natures being in no way destroyed by the union, but rather the distinctive character of each nature being ceaselessly preserved and coming together into one person and one hypostasis.'⁷⁰

Now that we have set this out distinctly and judiciously, he has been shown to hold different opinions than the holy fathers and to oppose the definitions of fathers and councils; and he rightly stands condemned by them through having nothing in common with them, on account of the evident deviation of his statements.

[132] Benedict the most devout bishop of Ajaccio⁷¹ said:

'The commandment of the law is a lamp and a light, and reproof and discipline are the paths of life',⁷² by which your beatitude most wisely and with great precision has 'made a separation between darkness and

68 Ps.-Dionysius, *ep.* 4, in *Corpus Dionysiacum*, II, pp. 160, 11–161, 2.

69 Basil of Caesarea, *Hom. de gratiarum actione*, PG 31. 228C–229A.

70 Chalcedonian Definition, ACO II. 1, p. 325, 31–3. 'Ceaselessly' is an addition to the original text, absent from the reading of the whole text in Session IV (p. 272 below).

71 The Latin reads 'bishop of the island of Corsica'.

72 Prov 6:23.





light',⁷³ I mean between Theodore bishop of Pharan and the teachers of the catholic church. You have justly condemned the former for (like a dark night) lacking the light of patristic truth, while you have properly and becomingly honoured the latter for being an ever-radiant day, presenting them as illuminating us with definitions of piety and strengthening us with words of truth. For it is written, 'I am the Lord your God: you shall not commit injustice in judgement, nor shall you welcome the person of a wealthy man or gape at the person of a mighty one',⁷⁴ and 'Abstain from every unjust word: you shall not slay the innocent and righteous, nor shall you acquit the impious.'⁷⁵ Therefore, since we too unanimously condemn for heresy this impious man and his doctrine, bid us, if it is pleasing to your holiness, to examine also by means of a reading the composition of the Nine Chapters of Cyrus who was bishop of Alexandria, especially the Seventh Chapter, in which he perverted the teaching of the fathers, and then immediately in sequence the letter also of Sergius, then bishop of Constantinople, in which he lauds and approves Cyrus for this perversion.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

May those who are devotedly assisting the proceedings fulfil the request of our beloved brother Bishop Benedict, who has mentioned the Nine Chapters of Cyrus bishop of Alexandria together with the letter of Sergius the former bishop of Constantinople, in which he gives him his approval for them, declaring his agreement with him.

Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

According to the wishes of your most holy beatitude, I have brought the documents that you commanded to be brought, and have them to hand for your good pleasure.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Let the seventh of Cyrus' Nine Chapters be taken and read in the presence of the holy synod, and after it the letter of Sergius bishop of Constantinople.

⁷³ Gen 1:4.

⁷⁴ Lev 19:14b–15.

⁷⁵ Exod 23:7.





[134] And, taking it, Anastasius, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out the following, translated from Greek into Latin:

The Seventh Chapter of Cyrus the former bishop of Alexandria⁷⁶ If anyone, affirming that the one our Lord⁷⁷ Jesus Christ is perceived in two natures, does not acknowledge that he is one of the Trinity, God the Word eternally begotten from the Father, the same incarnate in the last times of this age and born from our Lady, the all-holy and immaculate Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary, but instead considers him to be one and another and not one and the same, 'perfect in Godhead and the same perfect in manhood' (according to the most wise Cyril),⁷⁸ and in this respect alone perceived 'in two natures', the same suffering in one [nature] and not suffering in the other, as the same Cyril said, suffering humanly in the flesh as man but remaining impassible as God in the sufferings of his own flesh, the same one Christ and one Son performing what is divine and what is human by one theandric operation (according to the sainted Dionysius)⁷⁹ – and one should distinguish in perception alone the elements⁸⁰ from which the union took place, and mentally ascertain that these remain without change or fusion after their natural and hypostatic union, the one and the same Christ and Son being acknowledged in them without division or separation, while one mentally beholds the elements that have been brought together without fusion, deeming their perception to be objective and not in false imagination and vain inventions of the mind,⁸¹ without separating

76 The Latin version adds, 'from the set of chapters that he had read out in the presence of all the Acephali in Ammon as a record of the orthodox faith'.

77 The traditional meaning of the Greek phrase was 'our one Lord', but in sixth- and seventh-century texts, in the context of stressing the unity of Christ, God and man, the notions of oneness and lordship in Christ tended to become distinct, as is clear in such paraphrases as 'one and the same our Lord Jesus Christ' and 'one Son our Lord Jesus Christ'.

78 In his *Laetentur caeli* letter to John of Antioch (Price and Gaddis (2005) I, 181). As suggested here, it is indeed likely that Chalcedon's 'in two natures' formula derived from this phrase in Cyril; see *ibid.*, I, 69 and II, 189.

79 Cp. Ps.-Dionysius, *ep.* 4, in *Corpus Dionysiacum*, II, p. 161, 9, 'a new operation, the theandric'. Cyrus' 'one operation' is defended below (p. 224) by Patriarch Pyrrhus as a sound interpretation of the text but not as its original wording.

80 Here and in similar passages 'elements' is my supplement, where the Greek has simply an article or pronoun.

81 Cyrus insists that Cyril's formula 'two in perception alone' does not mean that the duality is simply an invention of our minds. Indeed, Cyril used it of the relation between body and soul, his point being that the two are distinct yet form a unity. See de Halleux (1993).





them in any way, since division into two has already been abolished by the ineffable, unconfused and incomprehensible union, affirming with Saint Athanasius, “at once flesh, at once the flesh of God the Word, at once flesh ensouled and rational, at once the ensouled and rational flesh of God the Word”⁸² – but [if anyone] understands this statement in terms of a division into parts, let him be anathema.’

A copy of the letter of Sergius then bishop of Constantinople written to Cyrus bishop of Alexandria:⁸³

[136] We have received the sacred words of your God-honoured sacredness, conveying the good tidings that by the grace of the all-holy Spirit and the zeal, pleasing to God, of our God-protected and victorious emperor and by the admonition, inspired and replete with all orthodoxy, of your all-holiness, there has taken place in the Christ-loving great city of Alexandria and all its territories⁸⁴ an ecclesiastical union of those formerly called Theodosians⁸⁵ with the catholic and apostolic orthodox [church], at which, filled with spiritual and inexpressible joy, we have offered up from all our soul hymns of thanksgiving to our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ, because at last, with the removal (by the help of God) of the ‘middle wall’⁸⁶ of division by which previously the common enemy of mankind separated brethren from brethren, all are revealed to have become ‘joined in body and in participation’,⁸⁷ making as one mouth and one tongue the due confession and ascription of glory to the glorified Trinity, source of life, as is pleasing [to God], and because all unanimously proclaim ‘one Lord, one faith, one baptism’.⁸⁸

By presenting to them the statements of the great and ecumenical holy

82 Ps.-Athanasius, *Ad Iovinianum*, PG 28. 532A.

83 This is the Second Letter of Sergius to Cyrus, written in reply to Cyrus, Second Letter to Sergius (ACO² II/2, 592–4). The Latin version expands the heading as follows: ‘in which [the letter] he praises him for “one operation” and confirms it as promoting union with the heretical Acephali’.

84 This echoes Cyrus’ letter (ACO² II/2, p. 592, 22–3). The claim for the success of the union outside Alexandria itself is too vague to have weight, but in his First Letter to Pope Honorius, written soon afterwards, Sergius was to claim that almost the whole of ‘Egypt, Thebaid, Libya and the other provinces of the Egyptian diocese’ had accepted the union (ACO² II/2, p. 538, 1–2).

85 The chief miaphysite group in Egypt, loyal to the teaching of Severus of Antioch.

86 Cp. Eph 2:14.

87 Eph 3:6.

88 Eph 4:4.





councils which convened by the grace of the Holy Spirit and defined one and the same orthodox faith – I mean that at Nicaea, that at Constantinople, the first at Ephesus, that at Chalcedon,⁸⁹ and the holy fifth council convoked again at Constantinople in the time of Justinian of pious memory – and by means of these casting every stumbling-block out of the way, like stones from the roads, you have made entry into God-beloved union practicable and extremely easy. For this your priestly perfection will receive a great reward from God and great praise from all men.

You have said that in the chapters you composed for them you acknowledge (for it is good to use your actual sacred expressions) ‘Father and Son and Holy Spirit, a consubstantial trinity, one Godhead in three hypostases’,⁹⁰ and that ‘one of the Holy Trinity, God the Word, born from the Father before the ages, came down from heaven in the last days and was incarnate from the Holy Spirit and our Lady, the properly and truly Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary’,⁹¹ that he took ‘from her flesh consubstantial with us and ensouled by a rational and intellectual soul, which from his very conception he united to himself in a natural and hypostatic union, and so was born from her as one, unconfused and inseparable’,⁹² ‘perfect in Godhead and the same perfect in manhood, the same suffering in respect of one [nature] and not suffering in respect of the other, according to the inspired Cyril, suffering humanly in the flesh as man but the same remaining impassible as God in the sufferings of his own flesh, and that the same one Christ performed what is divine and what is human by one operation.’⁹³ For every divine and human operation proceeded from one and the same God the Word incarnate.⁹⁴ It was in agreement with this pious conception that Leo of holy memory, archbishop of Rome, [138] believed and taught when he said, ‘Each form operates in communion with the other.’⁹⁵ Accordingly you have taught the assertion, befitting a priest, of ‘one Christ from two natures, namely Godhead and manhood’,

89 In his First Letter to Pope Honorius Sergius commended Cyrus for getting the Theodosians to acclaim Chalcedon liturgically, ACO² II/2, p. 540, 8–13.

90 Chapter 1 of Cyrus’ *Plerophoria*, ACO² II/2, p. 596, 2–3.

91 *Ibid.*, ch. 2.

92 *Ibid.*, ch. 4.

93 *Ibid.*, ch. 7, as quoted above, but with ‘one operation’ replacing ‘one theandric operation’.

94 That this was the best way to express the unity of Christ’s operations, rather than an explicitly monoenergist formula, was the message of the *Psephos*, as preserved in Sergius’ First Letter to Honorius (ACO² II/2, p. 542, 1–11).

95 Taken from the Greek version of Leo’s Tome (Price and Gaddis [2005] II, 19). This





and you have acknowledged ‘one incarnate nature of God the Word, according to the sainted Cyril, and one composite hypostasis, which is our Lord Jesus Christ, one of the holy and consubstantial Trinity’.⁹⁶ Likewise, in preaching acknowledgement of ‘in two natures’ you expounded that ‘he is not one and another but one and the same, according to the all-wise Cyril, distinguishing in perception alone the elements from which the union took place, and mentally ascertaining that these remain without alteration or fusion after their natural and hypostatic union, deeming their perception to be objective and not in false imagination and vain inventions of the mind, since (clearly) division into two is abolished by the ineffable, unconfused and incomprehensible union.’⁹⁷

Having expounded this piously and with utter precision, you accordingly subjected to an anathema all the teachers of the impious heresies, together with whom you have condemned with similar curses all those who contradicted the Twelve Chapters of the all-wise and celebrated Cyril and did not repent but remained in the same error till death.⁹⁸ Having read this orthodox teaching of yours, through which the Lord of glory was pleased to build the union of so many of our brethren, we lauded his goodness and blessed your sacred priestliness, which has been privileged to assist this marvel, beyond all expectation, by both the grace of the all-holy and life-giving Spirit and the election and teaching of the divinely wise and truly pacific great emperor, who has his hallowed ‘heart in the hand of God’⁹⁹ and is truly directed and governed by it in all his undertakings – whom God, sole sovereign over all, will continue mightily to strengthen and preserve, guarding him as the stay both of the holy churches {of God}¹⁰⁰ and of the unimpeachable faith of Christians, and bestowing on him length of years, plenitude of peace, and the subjection of all hostile nations, as he transmits to his children’s children the imperial power.

May he also supply in abundance to your sacred and all-holy love his grace on your lips and ‘a word in the opening of your mouth’,¹⁰¹ through which the remnant (as is likely) of those who differ from us without rhyme

same citation was used in a similar context in the *Psephos*, as preserved in the letter to Honorius (p. 546, 15–17; Allen, 192).

96 *Plerophoria*, ch. 6.

97 *Ibid.*, ch. 7.

98 *Ibid.*, ch. 8.

99 Prov 21:1.

100 Supplied from the Latin.

101 Cp. Eph 6:19.





or reason will be rescued, as they follow in the steps of the children we so longed for and who are newly united to us. Clasp[ing] them through you (who are pleasing to God) in a spiritual embrace {and greeting them with a holy kiss},¹⁰² we pray that they attain the enjoyment of all the good gifts of God.

The subscription. While enjoying good health in the Lord, pray for us, most God-beloved brother.

[140] Sergius the most devout bishop of Tempsa said:

Since, as you have heard, most blessed one, Cyrus bishop of Alexandria, in the chapter of his just read to us, mentioned the statement of Saint Dionysius bishop of Athens that comes in the esteemed letter he wrote to Gaius, servant [of God], it is necessary that the book of the {said}¹⁰³ teacher be produced, so that we may see from a reading of the said letter if the statement is truly as Cyrus wrote in his {Seventh}¹⁰⁴ Chapter, and if Sergius in his own letter to him was right to commend him for it.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

May those who are assisting the proceedings bring the book of Saint Dionysius bishop of Athens.

Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

According to the command of your beatitude, I have brought from your sacred library and have to hand the book of Saint Dionysius, for your good pleasure.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

May the book of Saint Dionysius be received, and from the letter it contains to Bishop Gaius may there be read in the proper way in the presence of the holy synod the passage which Cyrus cited in his chapter to justify his innovation.

102 Supplied from the Latin.

103 Supplied from the Latin.

104 Supplied from the Latin.





And, taking it, Paschalis, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out, translated from Greek into Latin:

From the letter of Saint Dionysius to Gaius: ‘For the rest, he did not perform divinely what is divine nor humanly what is human, but, since God had become man, exercised for us a new operation, the theandric.’¹⁰⁵

[142] Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God’s holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

They who make war on the spiritual Jerusalem, namely the catholic church, imitate those who made war on the earthly Jerusalem, and endeavour – they too – to misuse the teaching of the fathers. Just as Rabshakeh once misused their ancestral tongue against the people of Judah in order to make his murderousness hard to detect,¹⁰⁶ so likewise do they with their false beliefs; for they do this with malicious intent, not to honour the fathers but to deceive the more simple, just as he did with the people of Judah. But, says the Lord, ‘you shall know them by their fruits, for they are like plastered sepulchres, which from the outside appear beautiful to men’ – just as the heretics do who use the statements of the fathers as a disguise – ‘but inside are full of {dead men’s}¹⁰⁷ bones and all uncleanness’,¹⁰⁸ I mean dead and fetid doctrines. For ‘they adduce terms not in their plain sense,’ as the great Cyril testifies, ‘but with a certain deceit and malice.’¹⁰⁹ Noting this well, we ourselves ought to be in no fear of reproach by men nor be cowed by their contempt, since this is what the Lord himself enjoins on us, saying through the prophet Isaiah, ‘Hearken to me, you who know judgement, my people in whose heart is my law: fear not the reproach of men and be not cowed by their disdain.’¹¹⁰ For with his fullness of wisdom the Lord exposes them and ‘hunts’ them down through you, his ‘hunters’ dear to God, according to the statement in Jeremiah, ‘And after this I shall send many hunters, and they shall hunt them on every mountain and on every hill and from the clefts of the rocks, because my eyes are on all their ways.’¹¹¹ The ‘clefts of the rocks’ are perhaps the more arcane statements of the holy fathers about Christ; for the heretics used them to contrive a

105 Ps.-Dionysius, *ep.* 4, in *Corpus Dionysiacum*, II, p. 161, 8–10.

106 Cp. 2 (4) Kgs 18:26–35 (=Is 36:11–20).

107 Supplied from the Latin version.

108 Mt 7:16 + 23:27.

109 Cyril, *ep.* 46, Second Letter to Succensus, *fin.*, in *Select Letters* (1983) p. 92, 35–6.

110 Is 51:7.

111 Jer 16:16–17.





deceitful disguise for themselves, so as to appear to be adept rather than abject¹¹² in the sight of God – to the less instructed, but not to you who are perfected in regard to God.

Therefore, as you see, the Lord himself has exposed them to you, as I have said, by means of the citation from Saint Dionysius just read to us, showing them up clearly to be liars, with the result that the words of the Lord apply to them, ‘Whenever he utters a lie, he utters what is his own, because he is a liar and the father of lies,’¹¹³ for ‘injustice lied to itself’,¹¹⁴ being unstable in those who lack stability. For since, as you have heard, beloved brethren, Saint Dionysius said that he ‘exercised for us a new operation, the theandric’, both of them manifestly calumniated the teacher – Cyrus in his Seventh Chapter, by altering ‘new’ and asserting that he said not a ‘new’ but ‘one’ theandric operation, and Sergius in [144] his letter to Cyrus on the matter, by joining with him in approving the alteration of ‘new’, and not only this but also by completely abrogating the teacher’s expression ‘theandric’ and defining simply ‘one operation’ in Christ God. And so they ‘committed deceit like a sharpened knife’,¹¹⁵ and did not take to heart the statement in the Psalms, ‘Will God not examine this? For he knows the secrets of the heart and the thoughts of such men that they are vain. For each spoke vainly to his neighbour; in the heart are deceitful lips and in the heart he spoke. But the Lord will destroy all deceitful lips and a boastful tongue – those who say, “We magnify our tongue, our lips are our own, who is our Lord?”’¹¹⁶ If they had retained these things in their memory, they would not have been seduced into such lawlessness, such distortion and abolition of the statements and doctrines of the fathers. Therefore, since we have found them to be in no way defenders but openly impugnors of the truth, not scrupulous guardians but blatant falsifiers of it, and for this alone to approve and welcome each other, reciprocating (each to the other) epistolary praise as a reward for impiety, it is appropriate that we uncover the source from which they culled such fruit of impiety, so that we may identify the tree from its fruit. Let there accordingly be brought and read out by those who are assisting the proceedings the book of the heretic Themistius, or rather excerpts selected from the same which will assist us in the present matter.

112 I imitate a wordplay in the Greek, μύστας ... μυσταροῦς.

113 Jn 8:44b.

114 Ps 26:12.

115 Ps 51:4.

116 Ps 43:22, 93:11, 11:3–5.





Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

The excerpts mentioned by your beatitude I have brought and have to hand, for the good pleasure of your holiness.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Let the book of the heretic Themistius that has been brought be taken, and out of it let there be read to us the indicated excerpts in it.

And, taking it, Exsuperius, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out, translated from Greek into Latin:¹¹⁷

(1) By the heretic Themistius, from the dogmatic letter written by him to Marcellinus the presbyter and Stephen the deacon about the one operation: 'The operation of Christ, proceeding through all that is divine and all that is human, is not twofold but one and the same, since it is of one and the same [person]. This is why Dionysius the Areopagite called it "theandric".'

(2) [146] By the same, from the work he wrote against the heretic Colluthus¹¹⁸ in which he testifies that the heretic Severus also acknowledged one theandric operation in Christ: 'It is easy to observe that the blessed Severus also, affirming of Christ that the same performed some things divinely and others humanly, chose to demonstrate that the operation is not only theandric but likewise divine.'

(3) By the same from the same treatise: 'Let Christ's operation be thought of as "one theandric", as we have said several times, but not as "one divine".'

(4) By the same from the same treatise: 'If the operation and knowledge of the Word is "one theandric", as we have often said, how could it be thought of as one and one, according to the abominable one – which would rather mean two and not one?'

(5) By the same from the same treatise: 'If it is only divine but not theandric, as we have often said, let there be no operation on our level, and you grasp the problem.'

117 Cp. the extracts from Themistius read out in Session V, pp. 352–4.

118 Colluthus was Themistius' miaphysite opponent on the question of the human knowledge of Christ. See Di Berardino (2006) 355–6.





Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

The heretic Themistius has revealed to us in the statements of his that have just been read to us that Cyrus and Sergius are his fruit and offshoot in doctrine, and that it was due to his teaching that through alteration they called the 'new' operation the 'one' operation, even though they became even more vehement than he in denying the truth, in that, as has already been said, they completely suppressed the teacher's term 'theandric' and declared simply 'one operation', as in his letter to Cyrus Sergius did quite plainly. Through thoughtlessness they were even less restrained in their definitions than the heretic Colluthus, against whom the heretic Themistius is writing. For Colluthus refused to call the operation 'theandric' because this {expression}¹¹⁹ indicates two operations, namely divine and human, and not one sole operation in accordance with Themistius' madness; this is why Colluthus said that the operation is divine and not theandric,¹²⁰ being consistent in this with himself, even if in disagreement with the truth, in that he advocated 'one' and not 'two'.

[148] Nevertheless, in addition to its being impious they (I am speaking of Cyrus and Sergius) show their own account to be inconsistent, in that they say that the Lord performed both what is divine and what is human with one and the same theandric operation, for it follows from one theandric operation that one should attribute to it what is theandric, not what is divine and what is human, as in their invention, since the divine accords with a divine operation and the human with a human one. But if the theandric were to be attributed to a theandric operation, it would follow that it is appropriate to attribute the theandric operation, as being explicitly 'one operation' according to them, to some 'God-man' but not to God made man, since every operation without exception derives its name from whoever exercises it by nature, which is why we call God's operation divine and man's operation human by nature.¹²¹ It is therefore impossible to say that the Lord worked both, that is, the divine and the human, unless the theandric operation is acknowledged by them to be both, namely divine and human. For if they hold that it does not signify two [operations] but is one, they must call it simple or composite or natural or hypostatic, in order

119 Supplied from the Latin.

120 Citations of Colluthus asserting one God-befitting or divine operation in Christ occur in Session V, pp. 354–5, nos 29 and 32.

121 See p. 87 for the metaphysical principle that operation corresponds to nature and vice versa.





to avoid declaring it non-existent through the lack of definition in its name. Accordingly, if they say it is simple, then, because it is simple, the Father also will possess it – for the operation proper to God the Father is simple – and he too, according to them, will perform what is divine and what is human by a ‘theandric’ operation, and consequently he will then by nature be God and man, and not by nature purely and only God. If they say it is composite, they are then representing the Son as alien to the Father, his operation and his essence being different, since the Father’s own operation is not composite. If they say it is natural, they are declaring that the flesh is of the same essence as God the Word, through possessing by nature the same operation that he does; and because things of the same essence are clearly different in hypostasis, then the Holy Trinity, according to them, will be a quaternity.¹²² If they say that the operation is hypostatic, they are again separating the Son from the Father in respect of operation, since he will differ from him in hypostatic properties. And if, compelled by all this, they say that there is one theandric operation because of the union [of natures in Christ], then they imply that God the Word possessed two operations before the union and then through the union made the two ‘one’, either by annihilating one of them or merging both of them.¹²³

Since, therefore, the argument of our opponents has proved to be totally fallacious, it is clear that Saint Dionysius intended to state not one operation, as they do, but the double operation of one who is double in nature, and used a word expressing composition in order to signify the two operations of the same [person] in union.¹²⁴ It is for this reason that he affirmed with fullness of wisdom that Christ did not perform divinely what is divine nor humanly what is human in order to teach us the completeness of the union (both of his natures and likewise also of his natural operations), since it is a property of the complete union to

122 If A is said to be of the same essence as B – that is, qualitatively identical to B and yet distinct from B (since nothing can be said to be of the same essence as itself) – it must be distinct ‘hypostatically’, that is, numerically, as an individual existent. Maximus the Confessor uses the same argument in the *Disputation at Bizye*, Allen and Neil (2002) 82–3.

123 This final suggestion is the nearest to the truth, though what the monenergists meant was not that the divine and human operations ‘merge’ but that they form a single operation through always operating together: as Ps.-Dionysius said (in the passage quoted above), the incarnate Word ‘did not perform the divine acts [purely] divinely nor the human ones [purely] humanly’.

124 The same interpretation of Dionysius’ phrase occurs in Sophronius’ Synodical Letter (ACO² II/1, p. 456, 13–18). The difference between ‘one operation, divine and human’ and ‘two united operations’ remains terminological rather than real. See pp. 87–90 above.





perform both operations through an interchange that transcends nature, that is, with the same [person] performing humanly what is divine and divinely what is human. For he did not perform what is divine with his Godhead alone nor what is human with his bare manhood, but through the flesh [150] (with its intellectual soul) united to himself hypostatically he performed the miracles in an extraordinary fashion, and with almighty power he voluntarily accepted the experience of his life-giving sufferings on our behalf, so as to manifest the union and at the same time display the difference, the union through the reciprocal impulse and congruence of his operations and the difference through the preservation of the particularity of the natures. It is this that was, according to the teacher, 'the most novel of all novelties',¹²⁵ but not in such a way as to show the two, namely the divine and the human operations, to be (as they supposed) one and the same operation. For this would have been a radical change and total annihilation, of such a kind as to make either the operation uncreated by nature created, or the one created by nature uncreated, or the created and the uncreated one and the same through fusion; but in fact the purpose was to show the one proceeding by means of the other without fusion. For in this way, as the teacher says, 'in our natural properties he surpassed nature, in those of essence he surpassed essence, and everything of ours he had from us and in a manner surpassing us'.¹²⁶ he manifested in [human] nature that which surpassed nature, without limiting it, and by means of what surpassed nature guaranteed nature, without diminishing it.¹²⁷ What proof of novelty surpassing nature is provided by saying simply that the operation is one? For no number is novel or astounding in nature, but what is truly astounding and the most novel of all novelties {according to the teaching of the father}¹²⁸ is the fact that the operations, both the one uncreated and the one created by nature, adhere in essence to the one and the same God the Word incarnate in unmerged and inseparable union, proceed through one another in natural coexistence, and reveal him to be by nature both God and man.¹²⁹

125 Ps.-Dionysius, *On the divine names* 2.10, in *Corpus Dionysiacum*, I, p. 135, 7.

126 Ibid., p. 135, 7–9.

127 Christ manifested his divinity in his humanity, without limiting or diminishing the fullness of either.

128 Supplied from the Latin.

129 The disagreement with Sergius is factitious, since this accords with his statement read out above (p. 214), 'Every divine and human operation proceeded from one and the same God the Word incarnate.'





This is also what the celebrated Leo, the president of our apostolic church, wrote after wisely pondering the matter: ‘For each form in communion with the other operates what is proper to it.’ He did not say that each of the forms united hypostatically in one and same Christ reduces, or changes, or fuses, or rejects what is proper to it, but that it performs it in communion with the other, in order to express the difference by the phrase ‘perform what is proper to it’ and display the union by the phrase ‘in communion with the other’. For this is what is characteristic of ‘the new theandric operation’, I mean the divine and the human, manifested as coexisting naturally in the same [person] in inseparable union. In rejecting and opposing these operations, Cyrus and Sergius neither conceptualised divinely what is divine, nor interpreted what is in the fathers in accord with the holy fathers, but by disguising their heretical doctrines in the words of the fathers insinuated them into the catholic church; it was because of this that, following the heretics Severus and Themistius, they wrote that the theandric operation is one. For this reason we condemn them together with their predecessors.

But come let us now hear the novel *Ekthesis* of the same Sergius, which at that time he induced the emperor Heraclius to issue in his own name, using it from then on to brandish error mixed with threats against the pious doctrines and congregations.

[152] Deusdedit the most God-beloved bishop of Cagliari said:

Receiving from the Lord a compact and consummate reckoning,¹³⁰ your divinely honoured beatitude, in the acute address you have now delivered to us, has exposed both concisely and knowledgeably the false teaching and the innovation that Cyrus and Sergius conspicuously concocted against the pious fathers and doctrines of the catholic church. You have shown that they were suborned by the profession of the heretics in their asserting, like the heretics Themistius and Severus, that the theandric operation was ‘one’, rather than being extraordinary and marvellous in the fact that it was a dual operation, divine and human, thereby confirming that in a union unmixed and inseparable the same [person] was both God and man by nature. As Saint Dionysius says, this is truly ‘the most novel of all novelties’, for by means of this synthetic expression of his the teacher declared to us not the abolition of each operation but their inseparable union. For the account he composed was of true union, not of any diminution whatsoever of the

130 Cp. Is 10:22–3 (LXX).





natures or natural operations preserved in existence in Christ God, which Cyrus and Sergius abolish in their writings that have just been read to us; this is why they falsify the statements of the holy fathers and have rightly been condemned by your apostolic and godly judgement. We in our turn condemn them for the same reason, in harmony with this judgement, and in addition Pyrrhus the successor of Sergius, since he too, no less than Sergius but together with him, accepted and defended Cyrus on account of his afore-mentioned Seventh Chapter, even while testifying in writing that he had altered the wording of Saint Dionysius and had been justly reproved for this alteration by Sophronius of blessed memory. For Pyrrhus writes in one of his dogmatic tomes as follows:¹³¹

The heretic Pyrrhus from his dogmatic tome that begins, ‘I for many years...’:

One chapter alone, as has already been said, was criticised by the most God-beloved Sophronius, on the grounds that it distorted the statement of Dionysius the God-bearing teacher by substituting the word ‘one’. In this especially the man was speaking plausibly and with assurance, with reference to Dionysius’ statement ‘Since God had become man, he exercised for us a new operation, the theandric.’¹³² For the document contained in all truth ‘one’ instead of ‘new’, not with ill intent (perish the thought!), at least in my judgement; but this word was inserted by the most holy Cyrus because ‘new’ can have no meaning except ‘one’. For by negating the extreme terms,¹³³ affirming ‘one’, and uttering this on its own, what else has the divine teacher done than clearly to convey, in whatever manner, that one operation should be acknowledged, since Christ is one?

[154] Note how clearly in his very own words Pyrrhus acknowledged that holy Dionysius’ wording had been distorted by Cyrus, recognised that Cyrus had justly been criticised for this, and testified that the blessed Sophronius had aptly criticised him, when he [Pyrrhus] said, ‘In this especially the man was speaking plausibly and with assurance,’ even though despite this he himself rejected the father’s ‘assured’ teaching and supported the heretical innovation, being of the same mind as ‘those who speak peace with their

131 This passage was also cited at the Sixth Ecumenical Council, ACO² II/2, pp. 606,16–608,5. Its defence of monoenergism implies a date prior to the issue of the *Ekthesis*, with its rejection of both monoenergism and dyoenergism.

132 Ps.-Dionysius, *ep.* 4, in *Corpus Dionysiacum*, II, p. 161, 9–10.

133 The divine and the human in Christ, viewed as two opposite poles.





neighbours, while evil is in their hearts',¹³⁴ for 'their tongue is a lethal dart (as says the holy Jeremiah) and deceitful the words of their mouth: it speaks peace to its neighbour and nurtures hostility within.'¹³⁵ For he praised the one who criticised Cyrus, namely the blessed Sophronius, and yet became a advocate of the evil under criticism by saying that 'new' can have no meaning except 'one' – manifestly in agreement (as has been shown above) with those erring heretics Severus and Themistius – and again by writing senselessly, 'By negating the extreme terms and making a singular affirmation, and expressing this on its own, what else has the divine teacher done than clearly to convey that one operation is to be acknowledged, since Christ is one?' He showed ignorance of the fact that the 'negation of the extreme terms' produces not a singular affirmation but a non-existent fantasy. For if he negates, that is, rejects, as 'extreme' both his divine and his human nature or operation, then he has entirely discarded the mystery of the economy. For if on account of this negation there be in God the Word incarnate for us neither divine nature and human nature nor divine operation and human operation, what is there left to affirm {in the divine economy}¹³⁶ save solely, as we have said, the empty fantasy of Pyrrhus' futile heresy?¹³⁷ We, however, rejecting this, together with his lawless adhesion to Cyrus and Sergius, which is the same as adhesion to the heretics Severus and Themistius, condemn it canonically, in true vindication of the definitions and decrees of the fathers and councils of the catholic church. For it is written in the law of the Lord, 'Your eye shall not spare him, nor shall you have pity on him, nor shall you shield him; but with denunciation you shall denounce him, and your hand shall be among the first against him to slay him, and the hands of all the people at the last, and they shall stone him with stones and he shall be slain' – I mean by the sharp and just words and doctrines of the truth – 'because he sought to draw you from the Lord your God, and you shall drive out the wicked one from among you.'¹³⁸

Now that this judgement has been made unanimously about the said men because of their perverse heresy which defends and renews the doctrines of the heretics Severus and Themistius, we request, as you have ordered, that there be brought to our knowledge and read out also the *Ekthesis* composed

134 Ps 27:3.

135 Jer 9:7.

136 Supplied from the Latin version.

137 Cp. Maximus in his *Disputation with Pyrrhus*, 'By negating the extreme terms nothing intermediate is left in Christ', PG 91. 348A.

138 Deut 13:9–11 and 17:7.





by the enemies of the {orthodox}¹³⁹ faith in the name of Heraclius who was then reigning.

[156] Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Let those who are assisting the proceedings produce for the holy synod here present also the *Ekthesis* of Heraclius for a most exact examination.

Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

I have to hand the said *Ekthesis*, as you ordered, for your good pleasure.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Let the *Ekthesis* of the emperor Heraclius be taken and read.

And, taking it, Anastasius, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out, translated from Greek into Latin:

[157] {The *Ekthesis* of the orthodox faith¹⁴⁰ made by our God-preserved and most pious lord the great prince Heraclius, on account of the dispute raised by some on the question of operation, and which accords with all five holy and ecumenical councils. It has been received with great satisfaction and favour by the bishops together with the patriarchal sees. They have assented to it gladly, as bringing peace to the holy churches of God.}¹⁴¹

[156]¹⁴² We believe in Father and Son and Holy Spirit, a consubstantial trinity, one Godhead or nature and essence and power and authority in three hypostases or persons. We acknowledge the particularity of each

139 Supplied from the Latin.

140 See Winkelmann (2001) 85–6, no. 50. The main sequence of the document – treating the Trinity, Christology, and finally (though briefly) the councils and the heresies – is the same as that in Sophronius of Jerusalem's *Synodical Letter* of 634 (ACO² II/1, 410–94).

141 This heading is preserved in the Latin version of this document, which predates the composition of the rest of the Latin Acts, as its vocabulary shows (Riedinger (1977) 49). Riedinger thought that it was composed in Rome, at a time when the *Ekthesis* (because of Pope Honorius' monotheletism) was still in favour there. However, the first part of it (down to 'the question of operation') appears also in a Syriac version of the text (British Library, Add. 14535), as Mario Conterno has informed me; this part at least must be of eastern origin.

142 The first part of this text synthesizes the teaching of three ecumenical councils, Nicaea, Chalcedon and Constantinople II (cp. Canons 1–10; Price (2009) II, 120–3).





hypostasis, unity in trinity and trinity in unity, a unity in respect of the principle of the essence or Godhead, and a trinity in respect of the hypostases or persons. For neither in holding the oneness in essence do we abandon the difference of the persons, nor in believing in a trinity of persons do we reject the one Godhead. 'There is one God the Father',¹⁴³ one God the Son, and one God the Holy Spirit; the three are one God in the sameness and immutability of the Godhead, for the difference of the persons does not introduce a division of Godhead or essence. Therefore we uphold one Godhead, while preserving the particularities without fusion and not merging the three into one person with three names, like Sabellius; nor do we divide the one Godhead into three essences, or separate the Son or the Holy Spirit from the essence of the Father, in accordance with the madness of Arius, 'for the Godhead is one in three,' as the great theologian Gregory says, 'and the three are one – those in whom is the Godhead, or (to speak more truly) who *are* the Godhead.'¹⁴⁴

[158] We profess that one of the Holy Trinity, the only-begotten Son of God, God the Word, begotten from the Father before all ages, light from light, 'the refulgence of glory, the stamp of the Father's hypostasis',¹⁴⁵ the one through whom all things were made, in the last days for us and for our salvation came down from heaven, deigned to dwell in the undefiled womb of the all-holy Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary, and having hypostatically united to himself (from the womb) flesh that possessed a rational and intellectual soul, was born from her. The same, being always perfect God, became also perfect man without fusion or separation, consubstantial with God the Father in Godhead and the same consubstantial with us in manhood, like us in all things apart from sin. Consequently we also profess two births of the only-begotten God the Word, one before the ages from the Father outside time and without body, and the other of the same in the last days from the holy and undefiled Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary with the flesh and its intellectual soul. And because of this we proclaim the holy and all-praiseworthy ever-virgin Mary to be properly and in truth the Mother of God, not as if God the Word took the origin of his existence from her, but because in the last days he was incarnate from her without change and became man, and accepted the voluntary passion in the flesh on our behalf.

Following the teaching of the holy fathers, we hold that Christ is

143 1 Cor 8:6.

144 Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 39.11.19–21, SC 358, p. 172.

145 Heb 1:3.





composite.¹⁴⁶ For in regard to the mystery concerning Christ, union by composition excludes both fusion and separation, and preserves the particularity of each nature, bringing out the one hypostasis and one person of God the Word together with his flesh and its intellectual soul, yet without our introducing a quaternity instead of the Holy Trinity (God forbid!), for the Holy Trinity did not undergo the addition of a fourth person, even when God the Word, one of Trinity, became incarnate. The one who worked miracles as God was not a different person¹⁴⁷ from the one who underwent the sufferings, but we profess one and the same Son, both God and man, one hypostasis, one person, passible in the flesh, impassible in Godhead, the same {perfect in Godhead and}¹⁴⁸ perfect in manhood, and that of the same are both the miracles and the sufferings he voluntarily underwent in the flesh. Accordingly we profess one Christ from two natures, one Son, one Lord, one person, one composite hypostasis, and one nature of God the Word incarnate in the flesh with its intellectual soul, as the inspired Cyril believed and taught. Holding the same to be also *in* two natures,¹⁴⁹ we profess that the one Jesus Christ our Lord, true God, is to be acknowledged as [existing] in Godhead and manhood, signifying by this simply the difference of the natures from which the ineffable union took place without fusion; for neither did the Godhead change into flesh, nor was the flesh transformed into Godhead, but each retained its natural particularity even after the hypostatic union.

Accordingly we know one Son our Lord Jesus Christ, from a Father without origin and a mother without defilement, the same both before the ages and in the last days, impassible and passible, visible and invisible. We proclaim that both the miracles and the sufferings are of one and the same, and [160] we attribute every divine and human operation to one and the same God the Word incarnate; and one is the worship we offer him, who was voluntarily and truly crucified for us in the flesh, rose from the dead and ascended into heaven, is seated at the right hand of the Father, and will come again to judge the living and the dead.

We give no permission to anyone at all to assert or teach either one or two operations in the divine incarnation of the Lord; but rather, as the holy

146 Cp. Canon 4 of Constantinople II (Price (2009) II, 121), though the text of this canon cited in these acts (p. 273) omits the word ‘composite’.

147 Expressed by the use of masculine pronouns, οὐδὲ ἄλλος μὲν ... ἄλλος δὲ ...

148 Supplied from the Latin.

149 For the assertion of both ‘from two natures’ and ‘in two natures’ as ‘neo-Chalcedonian’ see Price (2009) I. 71–2.





and ecumenical councils have handed down, it is to be professed that one and the same only-begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ true God performed both what is divine and what is human, and that every divine and human operation proceeded without separation or fusion from one and the same God the Word incarnate and is to be attributed to one and the same. For the expression ‘one operation’, even if it was used by some of the fathers, nevertheless offends and upsets the hearing of some, who suppose that it leads to the abolition of the two natures united hypostatically in Christ our God. Likewise the phrase ‘two operations’ scandalises many, because it was not used by any of the holy and approved enlighteners of the church, and because there also follows from it an assertion of two wills opposed to each other, with God the Word willing the accomplishment of the saving passion and his manhood resisting and opposing his will; this introduces two [persons] with opposing wills, which is impious and alien to Christian doctrine.¹⁵⁰

For if the abominable Nestorius, even though dividing the divine incarnation of the Lord and introducing two Sons, did not dare to attribute two wills to them but on the contrary taught an identity of volition in the two persons he invented,¹⁵¹ how is it possible for those who profess the orthodox faith and believe in one Son our Lord Jesus Christ true God to accept in his case two wills and these in opposition to each other? Therefore, following the holy fathers in this as in everything, we profess one will in our Lord Jesus Christ true God, since at no time did his flesh with its intellectual soul make its natural movement separately and of its own impulse in opposition to the bidding of God the Word hypostatically united to it, but when, how, and to the extent that God the Word himself resolved.¹⁵²

These doctrines of piety ‘were handed down to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word’¹⁵³ and by their disciples and successors, the inspired teachers of the church in sequence, which is to say the holy and ecumenical five councils of the blessed and God-bearing fathers, namely those who assembled at Nicaea, those in this imperial city, those at First Ephesus, those at Chalcedon and those

150 The whole of the preceding paragraph is taken from Sergius’ *Psephos* of 633, preserved in his letter to Pope Honorius (ACO² II/2, 542).

151 Cp. the florilegium of ‘passages from the heretics who assert division’ on pp. 355–7 below, with our comment on p. 295.

152 The last part of this sentence (from ‘since at no time’) is likewise taken from the *Psephos* (ACO² II/2, p. 542, 18–21), but the explicit assertion of one will in Christ is new.

153 Lk 1:2.





again at Constantinople at the fifth council. Following these councils in everything and embracing their divine doctrines, we receive everyone whom they received, [162] and we reject and anathematise those they rejected, especially Novatus, Sabellius, Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinarius, Origen, Evagrius and Didymus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscorus and Severus, the impious writings of Theodoret against the orthodox faith and the first holy council at Ephesus and against the Twelve Chapters of the sainted Cyril and what he wrote in support of Theodore and Nestorius, and the letter attributed to Ibas,¹⁵⁴ and we urge all Christians so to hold and believe accordingly, adding nothing to these [tenets] and deleting nothing from them, nor removing the everlasting landmarks (according to the scripture)¹⁵⁵ which the inspired enlighteners of the church laid down for the salvation of all.¹⁵⁶

The subscription. I, Heraclius, faithful emperor in Jesus Christ God, have signed.

Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

I inform your beatitude of a fact of which you are well aware, that in your apostolic archives we have the minutes of the confirmation of this *Ekthesis* by Sergius and Pyrrhus, who were bishops of Constantinople, kept in evidence against them, and in addition the letter of Cyrus bishop of Alexandria, in which he too together with them confirms and welcomes in writing this *Ekthesis*. So now I have duly mentioned these documents to you for your good pleasure and godly judgement.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Since it is especially on this account, I mean their monstrous proceedings in support of the said *Ekthesis*, that we summoned the most holy synod in session with us, for the refutation of our opponents' innovation, how can it be other than utterly essential, for an indubitable proof of their reckless assault on the catholic church and the definitions of fathers and councils

154 The list of condemned writers and writings is largely identical to Canons 11–14 of Constantinople II (Price (2009) II, 123–6).

155 Prov 22:28.

156 For the conclusion of a profession of faith by affirming the ecumenical councils and condemning the heretics by name compare Sophronius, *Synodical Letter* (ACO² II/1, 466–86) and Chapters 17–20 of the definition issued by this synod of 649 (pp. 381–3 below).





and their substitution of heretical doctrines, that these records together with the said letter of Cyrus be brought and read? For in this way they will truly receive a just condemnation from all the pious.

[164] Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

According to the instructions of your beatitude I have brought the said documents and present them for your good pleasure.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Since the proceedings of Sergius and Pyrrhus are known to all and incontrovertible, if it is your will, on account of their quantity let the assistants proceed through only the most explicit passages from them, in which they express in writing a confirmation of the *Ekthesis* [exposition] of their innovation.

And taking it, Theodore, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out, translated from Greek into Latin:

From the proceedings of Sergius bishop of Constantinople in support of the *Ekthesis*.¹⁵⁷

Sergius the most holy patriarch said: 'Let the decree presented by Stephen our God-beloved *syncellus*, composed by our all-pious and magnanimous emperor, and already familiar to us, be read by him with due reverence and inserted in the proceedings.'

Stephen, the most God-beloved presbyter, *syncellus* and archivist, read it out. And after the reading Sergius the most holy patriarch said: 'The most holy synod of our beloved fellow-ministers here assembled, has learnt and come to know the consummate perfection of our great emperor, wise in God, by means of the present proceedings relating to the *Ekthesis* of the doctrine of orthodoxy of our great and mighty emperor and by means of the previous reading that took place some days ago, for he has been "taught by wisdom, the maker of all things".¹⁵⁸ It should now make known through its own assent whether it approves and confirms with its seal the profession of doctrine that he has composed in this form and which, at least as appears to us, is flawless.'

157 This may be dated to November 638, Winkelmann (2001) 87.

158 Wisd 7:21.





The holy synod said: ‘The *Ekthesis* of our great and all-wise emperor, which has now been read, is truly in harmony with the apostolic teaching. These are the doctrines of the fathers. These are the bulwarks of the church. These are the foundation of the orthodox faith. These [166] are the symbols of the holy five councils. These establish the unity of the Christ-loving people of the whole world. These give strength to the weakness of the simple and assure the perfect and more knowledgeable. These work the common salvation of mankind. So we too believe, these we too confirm, to these we too assent.’

And a little further down. The most holy and most blessed Sergius, archbishop and ecumenical patriarch, said: ‘Perfectly, clearly and concisely, in words guided by the principle of virtue, has the eloquence of the divinely wise and all-pious master and great emperor issued this definition, after receiving this grace as well from God.’

And shortly afterwards: ‘Therefore, finding that his profession accords with the holy ecumenical councils and that he has most accurately compiled and confirmed the rule of orthodox doctrine ...’

And further down: ‘We too receive and confirm his *Ekthesis*, because accurately and without flaw it follows in all respects the teaching of the holy and approved fathers and heralds of our orthodox faith. Therefore, if from now on anyone, in contempt of the prohibition by the most mighty and divinely established master and great emperor and by the sacred synod here assembled, has the temerity to define or ascribe to Christ our true God either one or two operations, if he is a bishop or presbyter or deacon or of the subsequent ranks, we decree that he has forfeited all priestly service and ministry, while if he wears the monastic habit or is a layman, we exclude him from receiving the holy communion of the life-giving body and blood of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ,¹⁵⁹ until such time as those who use these expressions return to what is right and in sincere repentance and contrition provide on their own behalf a sufficient assurance of such a conversion; for then each of them will be restored to his former office.’

The subscription. I, Sergius by the mercy of God bishop of Constantinople Rome, have signed. Glory to Christ our God. Amen.

159 The specification of deposition for offending clergy and excommunication for offending laymen was standard (cp. Price (2009) II. 126, for Constantinople II).





[168] From the proceedings in support of the same *Ekthesis* by Pyrrhus bishop of Constantinople.¹⁶⁰

The most holy and most blessed archbishop and ecumenical patriarch Pyrrhus said:

Now truly the grace of the All-Holy Spirit, inspiring those present together, has obliterated all error and enlightened the understanding of the faithful with the doctrines of piety, while the great and most clement emperor has himself, like a beacon, beamed this forth [the *Ekthesis*] and illuminated every part of the world.

And again shortly afterwards: Like the great emperor, revealed as the author of great things, so too (naturally enough) we ourselves, following its purport and accepting in every respect the composition of his dogmatic and divinely inspired teaching, which is in accord in all respects with the apostolic tradition and the holy and ecumenical five councils, crown it with abundant praise, rising to the skies, on account of such an intensity of godly zeal. According to the measure of the power within us, we offer up fervent prayers constantly to God on behalf of his pious and enlightened soul, that the power of his rule may remain unshaken, subduing all the barbarian tribes,¹⁶¹ and so be passed down after very many years and in deep peace to his children's children, and that there may be granted him in time to come the enjoyment of eternal life. We decree with the help of grace that those of the most sacred bishops in session with us who have not already in the preceding time signed the publication of the imperial pronouncement should now append their subscription to the acts after our signature, and also that those bishops who are present separately in this imperial city protected by God and have not already signed should subscribe through the diligence of our assistants. We shall no less ensure (God willing) the open despatch of our proceedings, together with an encyclical letter from ourselves, to those who are absent, so that each of them likewise may assent with his own signature to the same proclamation of piety,¹⁶² and by subscription append his own judgement to the most sacred bishops who

160 For this synod see Winkelmann (2001) 87–8.

161 Emperors who upheld orthodoxy could expect to be rewarded by God with both eternal salvation and victory over their enemies. Cp. the following letter from Cyrus to Sergius, and the close of the address to Constantine IV by the bishops of Constantinople III, ACO² II/2, 820.

162 This lost encyclical is Winkelmann (2001) 89, no. 56. Pope John IV replied to it in 641, protesting in particular at Pyrrhus' exploitation of Pope Honorius' monothelite letter to Sergius of Constantinople (Winkelmann (2001) 97–9, no. 69).





have preceded him, in order that the fount of the saving doctrines may remain for us unsullied and utterly transparent – the fount from which the rational sheep of the Lord are wont to draw and drink, fattened by the flow of the divine stream and remaining wholly free from thirst.

But whoever does not do this readily but persists in disobedience will incur most wretchedly the condemnation due to those who have severed themselves from the fullness of the body of Christ, [170] and will call down on himself an inexorable verdict by authority of the apostolic sees, until by a more accurate investigation he recall himself to the path of the saved.

The subscription. I, Pyrrhus by the mercy of God bishop of Constantinople Rome, have subscribed. Glory to Christ our God. Amen.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

In these documents (I am referring to their proceedings relating to the *Ekthesis*) Sergius and Pyrrhus are revealed clearly and unambiguously as bestowing on it their approval and confirmation in writing and maintaining their own culpable confession, standing alone in opposition to that of the holy fathers, to the loss of their own souls. At first they were alone in making this confession – to the extent that they stand convicted of having striven on its behalf – but [then] they eagerly pressed others to join them in carrying through this highly provocative campaign, even if they viciously exploited another name¹⁶³ to terrify people, brandishing before them (as has already been said) the threat of being denounced by the orthodox. Therefore, after this sure judgment on them on the basis on what has just been read, come now and let us look at the letter of Cyrus, in which he senselessly presents his agreement with them.

Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

In accordance with the wishes of your holiness, I have brought and present the letter of Cyrus, who was bishop of Alexandria, for your good pleasure.

Amabilis the most God-beloved bishop of Ostia said:

Let the proposed letter of Cyrus bishop of Alexandria be taken and read.

163 That of the emperor Heraclius.





Taking it, Exsuperius, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out, translated from Greek into Latin:

[172] *The heading.* To my master honoured by God and most blessed in every respect, spiritual brother and fellow minister Sergius, archbishop and patriarch, from the most insignificant Cyrus of Alexandria.¹⁶⁴

The text. When we were about to dispatch a response to the all-fortunate [city of Constantinople], the most glorious general Eustathius received and brought to me the all-honoured words of the God-honoured beatitude of my distinguished master [Sergius], enclosing a copy, [addressed] to Isaacius the most exalted patrician and exarch of Italy, of the *Ekthesis* of our all-venerable faith composed in a manner timely, far-sighted and pleasing to God by our most pious and God-protected master and great emperor, which now needs to be ratified by our common brother the most holy Severinus, who, with the help of God, is to be consecrated in Rome.¹⁶⁵ I went through it carefully not only once or twice but many times. Delighted by the reading and delighting those with me because of the excellent exposition in the text, which is radiant like the sun and publicly proclaims our true and unimpeachable faith correctly and without error, I offered up hymns of thanksgiving to God the master of the universe for having given us a wise governor, who directs his holy churches felicitously and does not allow us to be troubled by the storm that may well be threatening, nor those who have pure recourse to them to be wrecked on hidden rocks, but instead leads us safely and benignly to a calm haven, while taking thought in godly fashion for the peace of the Christ-loving congregations they contain. The God who made him such and placed him among those spiritual will grant to his all-pious rule strength and might against the enemies who oppose his reign, obedient [to God], so that we may exclaim at that time with songs of thanksgiving, 'The one all-pious and thrice-august¹⁶⁶ has saved, has saved us, thrice he saved us,¹⁶⁷ I mean from tyrannical oppression and Persian

164 This, the third of Cyrus' extant letters to Sergius, dates to November 638 (Winkelmann (2001) 87).

165 Severinus was elected pope in October 638, but the emperor refused to allow his consecration until he subscribed to the *Ekthesis*. He was eventually consecrated in May 640 and died in August, probably still evading the emperor's demands. See Caspar (1933) 537–8 and Kelly (1986) 71–2. Eustathius' detour via Alexandria must have been to secure the assent of all the eastern patriarchs before Rome was approached.

166 This imperial honorific (τρισάγουστος) appears in acclamations by the Green faction at Constantinople in 532 and 602 preserved in Theophanes, *Chronographia*, PG 108. 420A and 607A.

167 Cyrus is imitating the repetitive style of loyal acclamations that were regularly elicited





ferocity, and also Saracen wilfulness. We too, having received your teaching and following it totally, embrace and preserve the pious and devout gifts of his all-calm serenity, as is known already to your all-holiness honoured by God, through what at various times has been written to you by our mediocrity, in words uncouth yet orthodox. To the whole brotherhood in Christ together with your God-honoured beatitude both I and those with me send abundant greetings.

The subscription: With good health in the Lord, pray for us, most blessed father.

[174] Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

In his letter just read to us, Cyrus bishop of Alexandria made known his agreement with Sergius and Pyrrhus over the *Ekthesis* of their innovation, joining them in confirming it in writing. They failed in their most malicious hope, 'having lied against their head',¹⁶⁸ for the *Ekthesis* of their impious and headstrong innovation, when dispatched here, was not received at all or (so to say) ratified according to their vain expectation, but was instead anathematised and condemned by apostolic authority. But because they wrote these things against the orthodox faith, and the task before us is a reasoned investigation of them, proceeding with great care (as is appropriate) through the testimonies of scripture and the fathers, let us, if it seems good, with the help of God postpone this examination of the matter to another session, restricting the present hearing to what has [already] been said.

in the cities, recorded, and communicated to central government. See Jones (1964) II, 722–3 and Roueché (2009).

168 Susanna 55 (= Dan 13:55 Vulgate).





THE FOURTH SESSION

SUMMARY¹

[180] The Fourth Act carries out a precise examination and comparison with one another of the perverse doctrines of the said heretics by juxtaposing them to one another and exposing them. It makes known by what they wrote against each other how they patently refute their own tenets as unsound, quite apart from the attacks on them by others or scriptural proof. Then it cites the pious definitions of the faith of the ecumenical holy five councils, to rebut the heretics' calumny against them in declaring in writing that they themselves held the doctrines defined by the holy and ecumenical councils.

INTRODUCTION

The fourth session of the synod took place on 19 October, two days after the preceding session, of which it was the continuation, completing the presentation of the texts of the 'heretics' and setting over against them the decrees of the ecumenical councils.

The session began with a speech ascribed to Pope Martin, commenting on the passages from the heretics read out at the previous session. He makes the following points. Cyrus, Sergius and Pyrrhus condemned themselves by approving the *Ekthesis*, since they had given their approval to monoenergism and yet the *Ekthesis* forbade it; they have thereby incurred the deposition imposed by the *Ekthesis* on all monoenergists, while by claiming that the teaching of the document corresponded to that of the ecumenical councils they admitted that their monoenergism did not. In conclusion Martin gave directions for a reading of the relevant statements in the church fathers and the ecumenical councils.

¹ Taken from the Greek Acts.





At this point, however, Bishop Benedict of Ajaccio intervened, requesting that there be added to the list of heretics to be censured the name of Paul, the present patriarch of Constantinople, in view of his support of the same heresy and his persecution of the orthodox. Then a second (unnamed) speaker asked more specifically for the reading of Paul's letter to the late Pope Theodore and also of the *Typos*, issued by Constans II at Paul's prompting. Pope Martin approved this suggestion, and the reading of these two documents follows. They would (of course) have been read in any case, but these two speakers reduced Pope Martin's personal responsibility for the most contentious part of the synod's work – its condemnation of Patriarch Paul and the *Typos*.

Paul's letter to Theodore (pp. 254–60) was in response to a lost letter from Theodore of which the *Liber pontificalis* gives the following account:²

The holy pope Theodore wrote to Paul, patriarch of the imperial city, both requesting him and reproving him in accordance with the canons, and also through *apocrisarii*, as has been mentioned, who were specially delegated for this purpose and being present in person admonished him and declared that he should correct his falsehood and return to the orthodox faith of the catholic and apostolic church.

Paul's reply (dated to May 645) is a masterpiece of feline suavity, with claws thinly veiled. Refusing to be riled, he delivers an implicit but unmistakable rebuke to Theodore's bullying, strewing his letter with echoes of biblical passages on love and forbearance, and going so far as to liken his own patience to the patient suffering of Christ.³ There follows the requested statement of faith, which follows the *Ekthesis* in affirming that 'every divine and human operation proceeded from the one and the same God the Word incarnate' (p. 229 above), as a formula to bring out the unity of Christ's operations without defining their number. Paul proceeds to affirm, again following the *Ekthesis*, that there was but one will in Christ. This he expounds in relation to Gethsemane in the following terms (p. 258):

We do not at all apply the expression 'one will' in order to merge or fuse the two natures perceived in him, or assert that through the destruction of the other only one of them exists, but what we mean by this expression is that his flesh with its rational and intellectual soul, ineffably enriched with what is divine as

² *Liber pontificalis* 75.6, trans. Davis (2000) 70.

³ The letter from Theodore to which Paul is responding is probably distinct from the one preserved by Anastasius Bibliothecarius (PL 129. 577–82), though the peremptory tone of the latter could equally have stimulated Paul's rebuke.





a result of the consummate union, possessed the divine will of the Word (who hypostatically united it to himself) and not a different will.

This expresses a recognition that Gethsemane witnessed not simply a tension between the divine will and Christ's flesh but an assent to the passion by the rational will of Christ's humanity; this was precisely the main contention of St Maximus the Confessor, against a long tradition that ignored the role of Christ's rational will at Gethsemane and indeed in his life generally. But for Pope Theodore, as for the Lateran Synod, this was of no avail: Paul had condemned himself by asserting one will in Christ.⁴

After an intervention by Deusdedit of Cagliari, who stressed Paul's offence in ignoring papal admonishment, there followed a reading of the *Typos* of 648 (pp. 262–3), a brief document composed by Paul and issued by, and in the name of, the emperor Constans. The document deplores the 'strife' and 'quibbling' that had arisen over wills and operations as disruptive of social peace, and gives orders that it is to cease. The emperor's subjects are to remain content with what has already been defined by church fathers and councils, 'adding nothing nor deleting anything' – an expression of strict loyalty to canonised formulae that goes back to the emphasis at the First Council of Ephesus (431) on making no alterations to the faith of Nicaea.⁵ Those who have championed either monotheletism or dyotheletism are not to be subjected to censure or accusation, but nor are they to continue to promote their divisive doctrines, on pain of deposition from office, excommunication, confiscation of property or exile, as appropriate.

The reading is followed by a critical commentary (ascribed simply to 'the holy synod') akin to that offered by Deusdedit of Cagliari on the letter of Paul. The point made at greatest length is that it is irrational to forbid the teaching of *both* heresy (monotheletism) and orthodoxy (dyotheletism). Towards the end of the speech a further criticism is made (to be developed at greater length at Session V) that the *Typos* represents yet another chameleon shift in the opponents of orthodoxy, revelatory of their frivolity and irresponsibility: first (with Cyrus of Alexandria's *Plerophoria* or *Pact of Union*) they espoused monoenergism, then (with the *Ekthesis*) they switched to monotheletism, and now (with the *Typos*, with its ban

4 See pp. 161–86, with our discussion on p. 135, for the reaction to Paul's letter in the following year from churchmen in Africa.

5 E.g. ACO I. 1/2, p. 16, 5–8.





on attributing to Christ either one or two operations and wills) they are implying that Christ has no operation or will at all, which is to deprive him of both of his natures and of existence itself.⁶

The speech concludes with a reminder that it was agreed to examine the teaching of the fathers and the councils, in order to refute the opponents' claims to patristic and conciliar support.⁷ This leads to the reading of the following statements of faith: the creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople, the Twelve Chapters of Cyril of Alexandria, the Chalcedonian Definition and the canons of Constantinople II (553). This is followed by the final speech of the session, ascribed to Bishop Maximus of Aquileia (pp. 274–85), which explains the bearing of these documents on the dispute in hand. The point made is that these councils condemned several heretics who asserted one operation and will in Christ, even if the councils themselves made no mention of this particular error: the names adduced are Arius (condemned at Nicaea), Eudoxius, Eunomius, Macedonius and Apollinarius (all condemned at Constantinople I), Nestorius (condemned at Ephesus I) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (condemned at Constantinople II). Maximus distinguishes between those in this list who asserted one will and operation because they denied Christ a human mind and soul (such as Arius and Apollinarius) and those (Theodore and Nestorius) who did so because they regarded him as a mere man and so denied him a divine will and operation. The claim being made is that the condemnation of these theologians by the ecumenical councils applied also to the seventh-century theologians and patriarchs who revived their errors over will and operation in Christ, which made them liable to the penalties of deposition and excommunication that the councils had laid down.

Leo's Tome

The argument that the ecumenical councils had already condemned monoenergism and monotheletism by implication was, of course, strained. The nearest that a council had come to this position was the approval

6 Maximus the Confessor at his trial in Constantinople in 655 narrated how he had made precisely these criticisms (that the *Typos* wrongly equates heresy and orthodoxy, that it deprives Christ of will and operation and that, by contradicting the *Ekthesis*, it condemned its own authors) when speaking to the emperor's envoy who brought the *Typos* to Rome on its publication (*Relatio motionis* in Allen and Neil (2002) 54–6, 60). See, too, *Disputation at Bizye* (ibid., 82–4).

7 The reference is to Pope Martin's directions to this effect earlier in the session (p. 252).





– in fact, qualified approval – given in the Chalcedonian Definition to the Tome of Leo, which contained the statement that in Christ ‘each form in communion with the other operates what is proper to it’.⁸ This made the interpretation of Leo’s position an important issue in the seventh-century debate.⁹

Back in 626 a not yet monoenergist Cyrus of Phasis (later of Alexandria) wrote to Sergius of Constantinople, expressing doubts about Sergius’ monoenergist position, particularly in view of the manifest teaching of two operations in Christ contained in this sentence from Leo’s Tome; in his reply Sergius claimed that no orthodox commentator had interpreted the Tome in this way, and enclosed a treatise on the topic by Eulogius, Chalcedonian Patriarch of Alexandria (580–608).¹⁰ In fact, Eulogius had not anticipated the seventh-century debate but simply countered miaphysite claims that Leo was dividing the one Christ into two separate agents.¹¹ It was true that Pope Leo’s insistence that each form operates ‘in communion with the other’ excluded two separate operations and, as such, was not materially different from the monoenergist position.¹² But it remains clear that he would have approved dyoenergism, which accorded with the western insistence on fully dyophysite formulas.

The Tome of Leo remained the most powerful weapon in the dyoenergist armoury. Sergius of Constantinople implicitly acknowledged this fact when, in his response to Cyrus’ *Plerophoria*, he cited this sentence of the Tome as a reason for preferring to monoenergism his own formula: ‘Every divine and human operation proceeded from one and the same God the Word incarnate’ (p. 214 above). Similarly, Pope Honorius, in his Second Letter to Sergius, deplored the debate over one or two operations and offered instead his own formulation, likewise based on the Tome: ‘We should acknowledge each of the natures in Christ, united in natural union, operating and acting in communion with the other, the divine operating what is of God and the human accomplishing what is of the flesh, in

8 Cited, for example, at pp. 333–4, §3 below. Chalcedon approved Leo’s Tome as ‘a universal pillar against those with false beliefs’ (p. 272 below), but did not give formal sanction to its positive teaching.

9 For seventh-century discussion of Leo’s dyoenergism see Bathrellos (2004) 176–89.

10 Allen’s rejection of the authenticity of this treatise (Allen (2009) 28) depends on identifying it with the pseudepigraphal *On the Trinity and the Incarnation*, but in fact it is the authentic *Against Timothy and Severus*; see Photius, *Bibliotheca* 225, PG 103, 940B.

11 See the summary of Eulogius’ argument at *ibid.*, 945C–948A.

12 See our discussion on pp. 88–9 above.





neither separation nor confusion.¹³ It was this single sentence in the Tome that made it necessary to replace monoenergism by monotheletism.

The monothelete position

We must address a final question. To what extent does the case against the monotheletes that is advanced in this session do justice to their stance and motives?

Take, first, the criticism of inconsistency levied principally against the successive patriarchs of Constantinople – of first espousing monoenergism, then deserting it for monotheletism and finally abandoning both in favour of the critical attitude towards all the earlier positions expressed in the *Typos*.¹⁴ Let us start with the key figure in the earlier stages of the controversy, Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople (610–38). There is evidence of his promoting monoenergism from an early date in his long occupancy of the patriarchal throne. We hear of him sending copies of the monoenergist–monothelete treatise of his sixth-century predecessor Menas to both Cyrus of Phasis (later of Alexandria) and Theodore of Pharan.¹⁵ The accompanying letters were suggestive rather than dictatorial: Sergius asked Theodore for his ‘opinion’ of Menas’ tract, and wrote to Cyrus: ‘If one of the more precise were able to show that some of our approved and inspired fathers ... handed down the affirmation of two operations in Christ, we should certainly follow them.’¹⁶ We may say that Sergius advocated monoenergism as a *theologoumenon* (or theological opinion) but not as a formal doctrine of the Church. This tentativeness was displayed again in his reaction to Cyrus of Alexandria’s *Plerophoria* of 633, which achieved reunion with miaphysites in Alexandria on the basis of a Neo-Chalcedonian Christology that included monoenergism. Supportive of Cyrus’ initiative but reluctant to alienate its critics, notably the redoubtable Sophronius of Jerusalem, he discontinued his advocacy of monoenergism but defended Cyrus’ initiative as a case of ‘accommodation pleasing to God’, justified as a means to achieve church unity without doing any real damage to orthodoxy.¹⁷ In 638, alarmed by the increasing acrimony in the debate (for which Sophronius

13 ACO² II/2, p. 622, 17–20.

14 Exactly the same argument is advanced by Maximus in *Record of the Trial* 6 (Allen and Neil (2002) 60–1).

15 See ACO² II/2, p. 528, 15–19, and Maximus, *Disputation with Pyrrhus*, PG 91. 332BC.

16 ACO² II/2, p. 530, 15–18.

17 Cp. Sergius, First Letter to Honorius, ACO² II/2, pp. 538, 15–540, 3.





was largely responsible) and encouraged by a letter from Pope Honorius that spoke of one will in Christ, he issued the *Ekthesis*, which criticised both monoenergism and dyoenergism as liable to misunderstanding and referred, incidentally, to Christ's 'one will' as decisive against dyoenergism.¹⁸

Sergius died in December 638, soon after the publication of the *Ekthesis*. The case of Pyrrhus, his successor in the see of Constantinople, is notorious. He first confirmed the *Ekthesis* and advocated monotheletism strongly,¹⁹ but later, after his deposition, switched to dyotheletism in an attempt to win support in the West; when this failed to bring about his reinstatement, he promptly changed sides yet again. What of Pyrrhus' successor Paul (641–53)? For several years he contrived to stand above the debate, but finally in 645 he was forced by pressure from Rome to show his hand, and gave his support to monotheletism; but later, in 648, he composed the *Typos*, which attempted to suppress the whole debate. In saying that no one who had been active on either side was to be censured or accused, the decree made plain that its ban on further debate had nothing to do with defining orthodoxy or suppressing heresy but was simply intended to restore peace and harmony to the churches.²⁰

In all, none of the leading figures in the monoenergist–monothelete cause treated the issue as a matter of orthodoxy or heresy. There is no reason to doubt that each of them preferred monoenergist and monothelete expressions to dyoenergist and dyothelete ones, but their public advocacy of a series of positions was determined from first to last by what could be called political considerations, or, rather, to do them justice, *oikonomia* or accommodation for the good of the Church.²¹ It is clear that the argument advanced at this session, to the effect that the heretics had formally defined as dogma a whole series of utterly inconsistent positions, depended on a wilful misreading of the documents. An extreme example of misrepresentation is the argument that the *Typos*, in forbidding the promotion of any particular doctrine as to Christ's will(s) and operation(s), was teaching that he is entirely without will or operation (pp. 153, 266). A document that did no more than impose a moratorium on the debate was read at the synod

18 See our analysis of the *Ekthesis* on pp. 196–8 above.

19 See the extract from his letter to Pope John IV on pp. 358–9 below.

20 The imperial envoy Gregory, who brought the *Typos* to Rome, explained to Maximus that 'what the *Typos* brings is not an annulment of the sacred statements but silence, so that we may dispense peace' (*Relatio motionis* 4, in Allen and Neil (2002) 54).

21 This is well brought out by Ohme (2008a), who also treats the development of the concept since the fourth century.





as an attempt to impose a final solution, and to impose as that solution the most impossible of heresies.

The truth is that the publication of the *Typos* had snatched the carpet from under the feet of the dyotheletes. How could they continue to condemn the patriarchate of Constantinople for monotheletism after Constantinople has abandoned the doctrine? The Lateran Synod was already under preparation before the *Typos* had been issued, or at least before news of it will have reached Rome. It could not be allowed to derail the synod. The disaster of the near collapse of the empire before Islam was a signal proof of God's anger. The diplomatic evasions of the *Typos* were not accepted as an answer. To regain divine favour, strict dyothelete orthodoxy had to be asserted.

TEXT

[177]²² In the name of our Lord, God and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the ninth year of the reign of our master Constantine the most pious Augustus, fourteen days before the Kalends of November in the eighth indiction,²³ there presided Martin the holy and most blessed pope of the holy apostolic see of the city of Rome, with the sacrosanct and venerable gospels lying displayed, in the church of our Lord, God and Saviour Jesus Christ called the Constantinian, and there were also seated to conduct the hearing together with him the venerable men (2) Maximus the most holy bishop of Aquileia, (3) Deusdedit the most holy bishop of Cagliari, (4) Maurus bishop of Cesena and the presbyter Deusdedit, the representatives of Maurus the most holy bishop of the church of Ravenna, (5) Sergius bishop of Tempsa, (6) Reparatus bishop of Manturia, (7) Epiphanius bishop of Albanum, (8) Benedict bishop of Ajaccio, (9) Julian bishop of Horta, (10) Papinius bishop of Vibo, (11) Maximus bishop of Pisaurum, (12) Lucian bishop of Leontium, (13) Viator bishop of Ortona, (14) Bonitus bishop of Formiae, (15) Majorianus bishop of Palestrina, (16) Germanus bishop of Numana, (17) Laurence bishop of Perusium, (18) Carosus bishop of Falerii, (19) Marcianus bishop of Mevania, (20) Barbatus bishop of Sutrium, (21) Calumniosus bishop of Halaesa, (22) Peregrinus bishop of Messana, (23) Romanus bishop of Cerillae, (24) Crescentius bishop of Locri, (25)

22 This introduction and the following attendance list come only in the Latin version. The list is identical to those of the other sessions and derives from the subscription list to the synodal canons (pp. 384–7 below).

23 19 October 649.





Felix bishop of Agrigentum, (26) Marcellinus bishop of Clusium, (27) Geminianus bishop of Volaterrae, (28) Marinianus bishop of Populonia, (29) Luminosus bishop of Tifernum Tiberinum, (30) Potentinus bishop of Velitrae, (31) Maurus bishop of Tuscana, (32) Martin bishop of Gabii, (33) Adeodatus bishop of Spoletum, (34) **[179]** John bishop of Paestum, (35) Gaudiosus bishop of Reate, (36) Laurence bishop of Tauriana, (37) John bishop of Tropeia, (38) Luminosus bishop of Salernum, (39) Sabbatius bishop of Buxentum, (40) John bishop of Tarentum, (41) Rufinus bishop of Sipontum, (42) Adeodatus bishop of Ameria, (43) Gaudiosus bishop of Capua, (44) Bonitus bishop of Ferentia, (45) Maurus bishop of Senegallica, (46) Maurosus bishop of Ancona, (47) Bonus bishop of Ficuculae, (48) Fortunatus bishop of Auximum, (49) Thomas bishop of Lunae, (50) Bonitus bishop of Ferentum Polymartium, (51) Maximus bishop of Trecalae, (52) Paschalis bishop of Blanda [Julia], (53) Luminosus bishop of the Marsi, (54) Gloriosus bishop of Camerinum, (55) Decoratus bishop of Tibur, (56) Amabilis bishop of Ostia, (57) Albinus bishop of Portus, (58) Palumbus bishop of Fundi, (59) Theodosius bishop of Croton, (60) Scholasticus bishop of Fanum, (61) Helias bishop of Lilybaeum, (62) Aquilinus bishop of Assisium, (63) Eusebius bishop of Atella, (64) Martin bishop of Centumcellae, (65) Juventinus bishop of Stabiae, (66) Maurus bishop of Senae, (67) Laetus bishop of Luca, (68) Theodore bishop of Rosellae, (69) Andrew bishop of Ydruntum, (70) Justus bishop of Tauromenium, (71) Felix bishop of Panormus, (72) Laurence bishop of Tuder, (73) John bishop of Carinae, (74) Albinus bishop of Signia, (75) **[181]** Augustine bishop of Squillacium, (76) John bishop of Regium, (77) Barbatus bishop of Cumae, (78) Felix bishop of Terracina, (79) Oportunus bishop of Anagnia, (80) Firminus bishop of Blera, (81) Jovian bishop of Firmum, (82) Anastasius bishop of Narnia, (83) Theodore bishop of Tyndaris, (84) Sapienius bishop of Nomentum, (85) Maximus bishop of Misenum, (86) Gratosus bishop of Nepet, (87) Leontius bishop of Naples, (88) Paschalis bishop of Thermae [Himeriae], (89) Oportunus bishop of Pisae, (90) Donatus bishop of Mariana, (91) Bonosus bishop of Aleria, (92) Peregrinus bishop of Lipara, (93) Boethius bishop of [Forum] Corneli, (94) Valentinus bishop of Thurii, (95) Luminosus bishop of Bononia, (96) Crescentius bishop of [Forum] Livii, (97) Stephen bishop of [Forum] Popilii, (98) Callionistus bishop of Hatria, (99) John bishop of Vicosabinae, (100) Potentius bishop of Pola, (101) Leontius bishop of Faventia, (102) Donatus bishop of Sassina, (103) John bishop of the Unnogours, (104) Stephen bishop of Dora, (105) John bishop of Gabopolis, and (106) Victorianus bishop of Uzalis.





[182] Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:²⁴

In relation to what was read to us in the session that took place recently from the minutes of Sergius and Pyrrhus and the letter of Cyrus, which they perversely composed against the faith and to support their *Ekthesis*, pernicious in its innovation, it is appropriate for us, distressed in soul by their accord and convergence in this error, to utter the words of the prophet Micah, 'Woe is me, for I have become like one gathering stubble at the harvest and gleanings at the vintage, when there is no cluster for the eating of the first-fruits. Woe is me, my soul, because the devout man has perished from the earth, and among those men there is no one who is upright.'²⁵ 'All have turned aside, together they have been corrupted';²⁶ all have come together against the Lord and his most holy faith.

But come hither, and let us, my beloved, proceed with God's help to the scrutiny and examination of their words, and so by true demonstration confound their tongues, 'raised against the knowledge' of the only-begotten Son of God and 'uttering iniquity at the sublimity' of his incarnation.²⁷ Let us break their bonds by 'the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God',²⁸ and let us cast their yoke from us by the condemnation of their spurious opinions.²⁹ For then 'the Lord himself will mock them and deride them, and then he will speak to them in his anger and hound them in his wrath',³⁰ saying, in the words of the blessed Jeremiah, 'They have prophesied falsely in my name, for I did not send them and I did not command them and I did not address them. Because they prophesy false visions, divinations, omens and the choices of their heart, therefore the Lord says this of the prophets who prophesy falsely in my name: they will be thrown out into the streets of Jerusalem and trampled under foot by all who piously acknowledge me,

24 The first part of the following speech is notable for the quantity of biblical citations and echoes it contains. The Latin version of many of these follows the Vulgate. Notable is the citation of Prov 6:2, which follows the Greek save for one phrase (*captus propriis sermonibus*) taken from the Vulgate, which suggests the influence of the memory of a Roman translator rather than recourse to a manuscript. See pp. 389–90 below for an analysis of the biblical citations in the Latin version of the Encyclical Letter, which also suggest that the translator was a native Roman rather than a Greek.

25 Mic 7:1–2.

26 Ps 13:3.

27 2 Cor 10:5 and Ps 72:8.

28 Eph 3:17.

29 Cp. Ps 2:3 and Eph 6:17.

30 Ps 2:4–5.





and there will be no one to bury them.³¹ For no one by the use of sophisms can hide one who has been shamefully betrayed by his own tongue, no more than it was possible at the beginning to hide Adam with fig-leaves when he had become a transgressor of the commandment. 'For a powerful snare for a man are his own lips, and he is entrapped by the lips of his own mouth.'³² 'A requital for his lips will be given him'³³ by the Lord, namely the reproof of his impiety; for, says [the Lord], 'I shall reprove you and present [a charge] against your face, for you presumed lawlessness, namely that I shall be like you.'³⁴ For as the Lord said to Gideon, 'Let us take them down to the water' of true discernment [184] 'and let us test them there'³⁵ with canonical precision, as they fall prone on the spot through the exposure of their unholy thoughts, lest they 'be wise in their own eyes',³⁶ having no experience of the divine word, since, 'professing to be wise, they became foolish and exchanged the glory'³⁷ of the catholic church, substituting heretical error through their own innovation and their lawless proceedings against her, and bringing to mind what had formerly been rightly said by Jesus the son of Sirach: 'Strive unto death for the truth, and the Lord God will fight for you always',³⁸ for 'it is not good to have respect for the person of an impious man, nor is it holy to pervert righteousness in judgement.'³⁹

How shall we do this with skill? Principally by comparing their statements (I mean those read to us) to one another. For if indeed they refute their own assertions, proving them to be invalid and totally alien to the truth, they are shepherding the winds, according to the saying in Proverbs, 'Whoever supports himself with lies shepherds the winds, and the same will chase after birds that fly away, for he has left the paths of his vineyard and wandered from the tracks of his farmland, for he is journeying through waterless desert and land outstretched in drought, and gathers in his hands no harvest.'⁴⁰

Accordingly, as we have heard in the reading, beloved brethren, Cyrus in his chapters prescribed the following: 'If anyone does not say that one

31 Cp. Jer 14:14–16.

32 Prov 6:2.

33 Prov 12:14.

34 Ps 49:21b, 21a.

35 Jgs 7:4 (LXX, Version A in Rahlfs).

36 Rom 11:25.

37 Rom 1:22–3.

38 Sir 4:28.

39 Prov 18:5.

40 Prov. 9:12a–c (lacking in the Latin Vulgate).





and the same Christ performs both what is divine and what is human by one theandric operation, let him be anathema.⁴¹ Sergius, writing to him, and accepting and confirming this addition of his,⁴² uttered the following: 'Reading this your orthodox teaching and the inspired admonition, replete with all orthodoxy, of your all-holiness, I lauded the goodness of God and blessed your sacred priestliness, which has been privileged to assist this matter by both the grace of the all-holy and life-giving Spirit and the election and teaching of the divinely wise and pacific great emperor, for you have said (for it is good to use your actual sacred expressions) that the one and the same Christ performed both what is divine and what is human by one operation. These things you have expounded piously and with utter precision, and presented in them the statements of the great and ecumenical holy five councils.'⁴³ Pyrrhus again in his aforesaid dogmatic tome wrote the following in support of Cyrus: 'For the document contained in all truth "one" instead of "new", not with ill intent, at least in my judgement, but because "new" can have no meaning except "one"'.⁴⁴

[186] Since therefore Pyrrhus understands 'new' to have no meaning except 'one', he must understand the 'ancient of days'⁴⁵ to be not one but many, or at least two. For if 'new' is not otherwise defined than 'one' and 'ancient' is the not the same as 'new', then (as has already been said) he will not understand the 'ancient of days' to be one, but would rather define him to be many or a more moderate two, with the result that he will become infected with polytheism, dividing the unique God (unoriginate by nature) into many gods, through his lack of awareness that 'new' is indicative not at all of number but of an extraordinary and unprecedented miracle, just as 'ancient' is indicative of antiquity or unoriginateness. But nevertheless, even though Sergius and Pyrrhus wrote these things in support of Cyrus, yet in their *Ekthesis*, rejecting what they had said shortly before, they wrote explicitly that what they had acknowledged as approved was worthless, what as true, false, what as pious, impious, what as flawless, flawed, what as godly, godless, what as innocent, criminal, what as accurate, unsound, and that what they had testified in writing

41 An abbreviated version of Cyrus' Chapter 7, given in full at p. 212 above.

42 The addition of 'one' to Ps.-Dionysius' phrase 'theandric operation'; see pp. 217–18 above.

43 This summary is made up of excerpts from the letter of Sergius to Cyrus given in full in Session III (pp. 213–16).

44 Taken from the extract from Pyrrhus' tome in Session III (p. 224).

45 Dan 7:9.





and defined with an anathema against those dissenting from this position was entirely alien to the holy ecumenical five councils. Incurring the penalty of their own anathema through deserting their own erroneous doctrines on this subject, they say the following: 'We give no permission to anyone at all to assert or teach either one or two operations in the divine incarnation of the Lord ... Therefore, following the holy fathers in this as in everything, we profess one will in our Lord Jesus Christ true God.' They add: 'These doctrines of piety were handed down to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word and by their disciples and successors, the inspired teachers of the church in sequence, which is to say the holy and ecumenical five councils of the blessed and God-bearing fathers, namely those who assembled at Nicaea, those in this imperial city, those at Ephesus I, those at Chalcedon, and those again at Constantinople at the fifth council.'⁴⁶

Confirming this *Ekthesis*, the said Sergius and Pyrrhus in their minutes, in order to display all the more to everyone everywhere the mutual rejection of their own doctrines, pronounced what we have heard. Sergius.⁴⁷

Perfectly, clearly and concisely, in words guided by the principle of virtue, has the eloquence of the divinely wise and all-clement master and great emperor issued this definition, after receiving this grace as well from God. Therefore, finding that his confession accords with the holy and ecumenical councils and that he has most accurately [188] compiled and confirmed the rule of orthodox doctrine, we too receive and confirm his *Ekthesis*, because accurately and without flaw it follows in all respects the teaching of the holy and approved fathers. Therefore if from now on anyone, in contempt of the prohibition by the most mighty and divinely established master and great emperor and by the sacred synod here assembled, dares to define or ascribe to Christ our true God either one or two operations, if he is a bishop or presbyter or deacon or of the subsequent ranks, we strip him of all priestly ministry, while if he is a monk or layman, we exclude him from the life-giving communion.

In reference to this, most God-beloved brethren, even if we had myriads proclaiming it to us, would we ever believe their declarations, were it not for the fact that the reading of his writings has fully convinced us? For the contradictory and mutually destructive statements and doctrines of one and the same person (I mean Sergius) are those of someone who has utterly changed his position on one and the same matter (not even the most

⁴⁶ These two extracts are from the *Ekthesis*, p. 229.

⁴⁷ For the full text see pp. 226–30.





desperate madman would be impelled in this way against his own flesh), since he utterly annuls and obliterates what is his own by recourse to what is his own. But so much for Sergius.

Pyrrhus again, who agreed to a similar abolition of the doctrines he himself approved, wrote in his very own minutes about the same novel *Ekthesis* as follows:⁴⁸

So too (naturally enough) we ourselves, following its purport and accepting in every respect the composition of his dogmatic and inspired teaching, which is in accord in all respects with the apostolic tradition and the holy and ecumenical five councils, crown it with praise for this ..., and decree with the help of grace that those of the most sacred bishops in session with us who have not already in the preceding time signed the publication of the imperial pronouncement should now append their subscription to the acts after our signature ... But whoever does not do this readily but persists in disobedience will incur the condemnation due to those who have severed themselves from the fullness of the body of Christ and will call down on himself an inexorable verdict.

In harmony with them Cyrus also, performing the same overthrow of his own definitions in consequence of the same error and confirming the outlandish *Ekthesis*, wrote to Sergius about it as follows, as we heard in the reading:⁴⁹

[190] I went through it carefully not only once or twice but many times. Delighted by the reading and delighting those with me because of the excellent exposition in the text, which is radiant like the sun and publicly proclaims our true, immutable and unimpeachable faith correctly and without error, I offered up hymns of thanksgiving to God the master of the universe for having given us a wise governor ... We too, having received your teaching and following it totally, embrace and preserve the pious and devout gifts of his all-calm serenity, as is known already by your all-holiness honoured by God, through what at various times has been written to you by our mediocrity.

Concerning these statements that are so opposed to each other and so valiantly eradicated by each other, with the result that in future they will not need other people for their destruction, since they have recklessly inflicted this on their own statements through the conflict and contradiction of their own doctrines one with another, what need one say? Speaking in the person of the catholic church, we may fittingly utter the saying of David, 'They

48 For the full text see pp. 233–4.

49 For the full text see pp. 235–6.





were swallowed up, clinging to a rock'⁵⁰ – they and their words. ‘They were rent asunder but felt no compunction; they tried me, they mocked me, they gnashed their teeth against me. Lord, when will you observe it? Rescue my confession from their innovation, and my unique faith from their doctrines. Let their words tremble and depart, may they be cast out from my homesteads, and may they know that it is your hand, and that you, Lord, have done this.’⁵¹

For how could it be that they have not been ‘rent asunder’ (even if they ‘felt no compunction’), those who deposed themselves from priestly dignity and ministry and excluded themselves from the life-giving communion?⁵² Moreover, they anathematised themselves, both for asserting one operation in Christ and for not asserting one operation in Christ, as if both equally (asserting one operation and asserting no operation) were the approved, orthodox, flawless, accurate, sound, pious and perfect proclamation, according to truth, of all the holy fathers and all the five ecumenical councils, which is not only false but also wholly and formally impossible, containing in itself proof of its incoherence. For ‘two contrary statements about the same thing cannot possibly be true’, as Gregory the Theologian laid down when writing to Nectarius.⁵³ Clearly, therefore, even apart from the verdict of the fathers against them in reference to this matter, they condemned themselves by transgressing their own decrees, bringing upon themselves on this account, as has already been said, the very deposition and exclusion (together with an explicit anathema) from all priestly dignity and the communion of Christ our God that they themselves had enacted, all the more because their proceedings were not only impious and heretical but also completely and formally uncanonical. For no accuser or accused was introduced among them in person, as is required by proper procedure, to present their case by an unambiguous declaration or the naming of those to be interrogated, but they themselves took on every role on their own authority, for themselves, by themselves and against themselves, as accused, [192] accusers and judges: accused, as publicly censuring themselves for altering the statement of Saint Dionysius;⁵⁴ accusers, as openly criticising, or rather accusing, [the doctrine of] one

50 Ps 140:6.

51 Cp. Ps 34:15–17 and 108:10, 27.

52 By incurring the very penalties laid down at Sergius’ synod, as cited above.

53 Gregory Nazianzen, *ep.* 203.20 (SC 208, p. 94).

54 This refers to the passage from Pyrrhus, cited in Session III (p. 224), admitting that Cyrus had altered the formula in Ps-Dionysius.





operation; and judges, as frivolously concocting for themselves one faith in place of another. In consequence, because of the uselessness of the declarations based on conjectural opinion rather than true confession, the sequence of the proceedings was deceptively disguised by them through their saying repeatedly in their minutes ‘when’ some [people] and ‘that’ some and ‘as’ some [made a declaration].⁵⁵ But ‘there was no voice and no hearing’, as the great prophet Elijah said, inveighing in his time against the impious.⁵⁶ For the whole of their shameless proceedings consisted of groundless assertions and empty fabrications against the catholic church, because of which (as has already been said) in their madness they even turned against themselves, condemning themselves utterly.

In order that we may issue in council a censure against them, conducted according to apostolic and canonical jurisdiction, let there be brought publicly to our hearing the statements of the illustrious fathers and the definitions of the holy ecumenical five councils, which were alleged by these men in writing to preach and teach these doctrines with precision, so that from the truth of what they wrote these men may reap the fruit of their own testimony.⁵⁷ For it is written, ‘Lying lips are an abomination to the Lord’,⁵⁸ and ‘A false witness kindles lies and spreads dissension among brethren.’⁵⁹ This they have clearly done, spreading by their words discord and contention among all people everywhere.

Benedict the most God-beloved bishop of Ajaccio said:

The prophet David, foretelling, O most sacred one, your well-deserved recompense, declared, ‘The Lord will give speech to those who preach the gospel with great power.’⁶⁰ For having received from God with great and zealous application the inspiration of godlike speech, you have by opening your mouth made known to all that Cyrus, Sergius and Pyrrhus, ‘like a

55 These are not phrases that occur in Sergius’ and Pyrrhus’ minutes. The point being made is that these documents did not name the bishops who attended these meetings.

56 The quotation (of 3 Kgs 18:26) is not of words actually uttered by Isaiah, but describes the lack of any divine response to the prayer of the priests of Baal when they were challenged to a thaumaturgical contest by Elijah. Here the monothelete bishops are being likened to the priests of Baal.

57 What is being said is that a presentation of the decrees of fathers and councils will prove the falsity of the heretics’ claim that these are on their side.

58 Prov 12:22.

59 Prov 6:19.

60 Ps 67:12.





madly careering heifer, careered⁶¹ from the path of the truth. For, as Hosea says, ‘Their intrigues did not grant them a return to their God, for the spirit of innovation is in them and they knew not the Lord, because there is neither truth nor compassion nor knowledge of God in their doctrines, but a curse and a lie, theft and deceit and irreconcilable contrariety poured forth in their speech.’⁶²

Therefore, because judgement upon them this day is the Lord’s, through your holiness, it is necessary, if you so resolve, that to them be added for a similar examination Paul, the successor of Sergius and Pyrrhus, since he shares one and the same heresy with them, and therefore defends it with zeal, as his accusers have informed us in their own writings; or rather, he has made himself known [194] by his actions, subjecting orthodox people to maltreatment, imprisonment and exile. For in this way there will be a joint conviction for impiety pronounced on them all by the holy synod here present through a precise attestation and presentation of the definitions and statements of the fathers and councils.

All the most holy bishops said:⁶³

We entreat your beatitude: let Paul be added to those like-minded according to the request of our God-beloved fellow-bishop Benedict, and be subjected to our examination as well, so that, because of his equal innovation, he may canonically receive equal condemnation together with them. For he too has issued extravagant fabrications against the catholic church, with the result that he too fulfils the scripture, ‘The beginning of the words of his utterance is folly, and the close of his utterance is pernicious error.’⁶⁴ For in truth, as is stated in the appeals and accusations concerning him, he began by recklessly advocating the innovation and concluded by securing the deceitful publication of the *Typos*, for a persistent drop hollows out a rock. For this reason, if you so command, let us also hear the letter that he wrote to your holiness’s predecessor Pope Theodore of blessed memory, and let us also conduct a hearing of the *Typos* itself (using a copy) for the complete protection of the catholic church, since

61 Hos 4:16.

62 Hos 5:4 and 4:1–2 with several additions, including ‘the spirit of innovation’, ‘in their doctrines’ and ‘irreconcilable contrariety’.

63 This is equivalent to ‘the holy council said’, a phrase that has a wide range of meanings in council acts. Here it introduces a request from the floor made by an unnamed bishop, perhaps supported by acclamations by other bishops.

64 Eccl 10:13.





he clearly prompted the publication of the *Typos* for the overthrow of the doctrines of the fathers. For these men, dismissing the definitions and statements of the apostles, fathers and councils of the catholic church, have craftily had recourse to secular decrees,⁶⁵ disguising their own heresy in this way and at the same time shifting the blame unjustly from themselves onto others, with the result that they will 'receive from the hand of the Lord double for their sins',⁶⁶ for both their own transgression and their calumny against others.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

It is with good reason that the most holy synod in session with us has asked for Paul's letter to be brought by the assistants for examination; for since his error is equal and akin to theirs, it is appropriate that on the basis of proof we issue an equal censure against them all. Let, therefore, be brought the dogmatic letter written by Paul to our predecessor Pope Theodore of blessed memory, and with it a copy of the *Typos* whose composition he secured for the rejection of the doctrines of the fathers.

[196] Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

According to your beatitude's command, I have brought Paul's letter together with a copy of the *Typos* (I am referring to the one published recently in the year now past at the prompting of the same Paul), and have it to hand for your good pleasure.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Let the letter of Bishop Paul of Constantinople be taken first and read by the assistants.

And, taking it, Paschalis, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out translated from Greek into Latin:⁶⁷

The heading. To the all-holy and most blessed brother and fellow minister lord Theodore, the unworthy bishop Paul sends greetings.

65 The Greek phrase is κοσμικοῦς τύπους, referring to the *Ekthesis* and the *Typos*, both issued in the name of the emperor. The speaker lays the blame for their production on the patriarchs of Constantinople and ignores their authority.

66 Is 40:2.

67 The subscription at the end dates this letter to May 645.





The text. ‘Behold, what is more beautiful or what more delightful than brothers dwelling in unity?’⁶⁸ I mean in the spiritual dwelling, the accord of unity and faith in God, this truly delightful habitation that is especially fitting for Aaron and those adorned with priestly dignity, making (like ‘myrrh on the head’) the leading minds fragrant, and extending to its ‘border’ or final impulse; for in this dwelling-place has the Lord ‘enjoined blessing and eternal life’.⁶⁹

So we, cleaving to this prophetic utterance, have composed the present fraternal letter, for love’s sake neither seeking nor demanding our own. For it is not good for those calumniated to calumniate in return,⁷⁰ nor with a stake to knock out a stake, according to the common proverb.⁷¹ Far from it! Such behaviour is not ours – heaven forbid! The mode of behaviour we were taught is not to prevail in this way but with patient endurance and gentleness of spirit. For just as, according to the prophetic saying, ‘black cummin is not purified by harshness’,⁷² neither is the fruit of peace, abundant in reflections, exhibited by severity. For this reason we have put up perhaps with verbal buffets, in order to imitate, however faintly, the one who humbled himself on our account,⁷³ and **[198]** by affliction *here* to escape the affliction of final punishment *there*. Let us therefore heed and obey the advocate of the church, the tongue of the Spirit [St Paul], exclaiming with a great voice, ‘Let all you do be done in love.’⁷⁴ So whether we inquire or only speak or only listen, let love be our leader, as an art to secure union and a good conscience, for we who inquire about God, measuring the precinct with the cord of right reasoning,⁷⁵ should lodge in it peaceably, since the Lord said through the prophet, ‘Seeking seek and dwell with me.’⁷⁶ For the Lord has made us a beacon for his people,⁷⁷ and it is right for those appointed by God to priesthood to make the steps of reasoning with one another with such courtesy that those who watch us closely are edified, rather than the path of

68 Ps 132:1.

69 Cp. Ps 132:2–3, ‘like myrrh on the head which descends to the beard, the beard of Aaron, which descends to the border of his raiment ... because there has the Lord enjoined blessing and eternal life.’

70 Cp. 1 Pet 2:23.

71 See LSJ 1346 for this saying.

72 Is 28:27.

73 Cp. Phil 2:8.

74 1 Cor 16:14.

75 Cp. Ezek 40.

76 Is 21:12.

77 Cp. *Apostolic Constitutions* 2.2.6.





their feet troubled⁷⁸ by our contentiousness, loath though I am to mention it. Let us agree in harmony, let us be united in love, let us respect the humility through which the sublimity of the Spirit is wont to be attained.

If until now we preferred silence to speech, we judged this to be right, lest we should enter on a competition in insults by replying to your letter in kind, and be condemned for malice by the one who has commanded everything to be borne in love.⁷⁹ For we vowed at the time to place a barred gate on our mouth,⁸⁰ and to place in our breast a principle of silence rather than one of haste. I accounted this a gift from the Lord, 'and I became like a man who hears not and has not reproaches in his mouth'.⁸¹ But since there is a time for speaking and a time for keeping silent,⁸² I open the gate by speech and close it by silence, praying as it meet, 'Lord, you will open my lips and I shall utter a word in reply to those who reproach me'.⁸³

For even if we have been silent, let us not always be silent, for God has opened for us the bars of speech through the arrival of the *apocrisarii* sent by your brotherly beatitude, who after many fruitless discussions with us about the church inquiry finally reached the point of prompting and urging us to explain the concept of one will in Christ our true God and to send this explanation to your all-sacred reverence. We, therefore, accepted the conscientious proposal of the said God-beloved men: knowing what the pre-eminent head of the apostles teaches, that we should be 'ready to give an answer to everyone who requests a word from us concerning the hope that is in us',⁸⁴ and combining in 'good conscience'⁸⁵ courtesy and the fear of God, we shall set out our view of this single question in this letter, shunning and eschewing verbosity and repetition as tedious and inappropriate for the present time. On this matter we do not think or hold or express anything of our own but 'what we have heard and learnt' from the great holy and ecumenical councils and 'what our fathers taught us',⁸⁶ for 'the ways of life are the meditations of the wise',⁸⁷ as the author of Proverbs supposed, rightly and truly.

78 Cp. Is 3:12.

79 Cp. 1 Cor 13:7, 'Love bears all things.'

80 Cp. Ps 140:3.

81 Ps 37:15.

82 Cp. Eccles 3:7.

83 Ps 118:42.

84 1 Pet 3:15.

85 1 Pet 3:16.

86 Ps 77:3.

87 Prov 15:24.





[200] But since the promised moment now draws and invites us to explain the question, come let us give shape and form to our orthodox convictions in written characters, clarifying precisely what we say with patristic testimonies, as with fast colours.⁸⁸ We, therefore (that is, the court and council of our church), acknowledge that one of the supra-essential and life-originating Trinity, the Son and Word of the unoriginate Begetter, the Lord Jesus Christ, our true God, was incarnate without change from the Holy Spirit and the immaculate Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary, and that the same is perfect in Godhead and perfect in manhood. We teach one person and one composite hypostasis in two natures after the union, acknowledging the difference of each nature according to their distinctive properties. We do not at all conceive or accept their division into parts or change into one another or merging or fusion (perish the thought!), but in the one Christ both natures are preserved, Godhead and manhood, and are retained and abide in the distinct definition of the essence within the ineffable congruence of perfect and hypostatic union; for the Word continued to be what he was, and became what he was not. For this reason we say that every divine and human operation proceeded from one and the same God the Word incarnate⁸⁹ and is to be referred to one and the same; consequently division is not introduced and absence of fusion is maintained.

May the multitude of impious heretics desist! May the malignant Severus, Eutyches and Apollinarius, together with Nestorius, Diodore and Theodore, be silenced!⁹⁰ In their antithetical dissonance they are consonant in impiety, the former wrongly espousing fusion and the latter division, both being fully exposed by the truth. We preach that the miracles are of one and the same God the Word incarnate, and acknowledge the same in the case of the sufferings he freely endured for us in the flesh.⁹¹ This is why

88 The following statement of faith is based on the two-nature Christology of the Chalcedonian Definition as clarified in the canons of Constantinople II. Note the emphasis on the Word of God as the subject of all Christ's attributes, both divine and human.

89 This echoes the *Ekthesis* (p. 229 above), itself echoing Sergius of Constantinople's Second Letter to Cyrus of Alexandria (p. 214).

90 Of the six heretics named, all save Diodore of Tarsus (d. c.390) were condemned at the Synod of Constantinople of 536 or Constantinople II (Price (2009) II, 123). Diodore is, however, described as 'impious and pestilential' in a document treated as authoritative at Constantinople II (Price (2009) II, 307); ever since the controversies of the 430s his name had been closely linked to that of Theodore of Mopsuestia, condemned at the same council.

91 Cp. Canon 3 of Constantinople II: 'If anyone says that God the Word who worked miracles is someone other than the Christ who suffered ... let him be anathema' (Price (2009) II, 120).





God is said to suffer and the Son of Man to have come down from heaven, on account of the incomprehensible and indivisible hypostatic union of the two natures. For this reason we also conceive of one will in our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, lest we attribute either opposition or difference of wills to one and the same person of our Lord Jesus Christ, or define that he was opposed to himself, or introduce a duality of [persons] willing. We do not at all apply the expression 'one will' in order to merge or fuse the two natures perceived in him, or assert that through the destruction of the other only one of them exists, but what we mean by this expression is that his flesh with its rational and intellectual soul, ineffably enriched with what is divine as a result of the consummate union, possessed the divine will of the Word (who hypostatically united it to himself) and not a different will,⁹² being always led and moved by it, 'since at no time did it make its natural movement separately and with its own impulse in opposition to the bidding of God the Word hypostatically united to it, but when, how, and to the extent that God the Word himself willed it'⁹³ – lest we be condemned for blasphemy, the mere mention of which produces fear and aversion.

Woe to the perversity [202] of introducing the notion that {his manhood}⁹⁴ was subject to compulsion from necessity of nature and shared with Peter in that merited rebuke, if indeed in its words it joined him in deprecating the passion!⁹⁵ Let us interpret the saying in the gospel, '[I have come down from heaven] not to do my own will but that of him who sent me',⁹⁶ and the deprecation of the passion⁹⁷ without introducing in the one Christ a differing and resistant will, and let us understand this saying negatively rather than affirmatively. For it is a statement not of what *is* but of what is not, like 'Neither my lawlessness nor my sin',⁹⁸ according to that accurate expert on doctrine Gregory the Theologian.⁹⁹ And all the teachers who have mentioned the saying at the passion have taken it to refer to, and

92 This is akin to Stephen the Monothelite's insistence at Constantinople III (680–1) that before the Fall Adam 'had a divine will' (ACO² II/1, p. 244, 14). Stephen was not denying Adam, and Paul is not denying Christ, a human faculty of will. What is being asserted is that the human wills of Adam before the Fall and of Christ at all time were fully in accord with the divine will.

93 From the *Ekthesis* (p. 229).

94 Supplied from the Latin.

95 This contrasts Mt 26:39 to Mt 16:22–3.

96 Jn 6:38.

97 Mt 26:39, Lk 22:42.

98 Ps 58:4.

99 Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 30.12 (SC 250, pp. 248–52), which I discuss below, p. 297.





appropriate, our substance, just as Athanasius the great illuminator of the church teaches us, presenting our nature in its love of life as passionlessly not choosing to be sundered from the present life;¹⁰⁰ but this does not mean that the flesh (with its intellectual soul) of God the Word was averse to the suffering salvific for the world or at variance with the Father and with the indwelling Word. For we accept the most precise expositor and interpreter of this understanding, Cyril the two-edged ‘spear’ of the Spirit, among the priests a second Phinehas in his zeal, who with a mighty thrust of his tongue pierced to perfection, together with harlot fusion,¹⁰¹ the depraved thought and expression of division, and who, in the fourth of [his] anathematisms of what in contradiction of the Twelve Chapters had been written by Theodoret¹⁰² (which were approved at the holy ecumenical council of Chalcedon and at the fifth council),¹⁰³ lucidly expounded and explained the saying in the gospel.¹⁰⁴ And all the teachers and preachers of piety agree with this doctrine of one will; from them, if a continuation of the inquiry makes it necessary, we shall cite the appropriate statements. In accord and agreement with these teachers were Sergius and Honorius, celebrated in pious memory, of whom the former adorned the archiepiscopal see of New Rome and the latter that of Elder Rome.¹⁰⁵

This is what we hold about these matters, this is what we believe, this is what we preach. In them [these tenets] is the demonstration of orthodoxy, in them is the boast of the church, in them is our hope of salvation. This is the nutritious plant of the Spirit, this is the salvific flower of the fathers, this is the life-giving paradise of the truth for the rational sheep.¹⁰⁶ We vow to

Gregory understood ‘not my own will’ to assert that Christ in his Godhead did *not* have a will of his own distinct from the Father’s.

100 Cp. the passages of Athanasius cited in Session V (see Index, p. 452). But unlike Paul, he has nothing to say about the role of Christ’s human rational will.

101 See Num 25:7–8 for Phinehas piercing an Israelite and his harlot with a ‘spear’ σειρομάστης, the same word as applied here to Cyril.

102 The reference is to three texts – Cyril’s Fourth Chapter, Theodoret’s rebuttal of it and Cyril’s *Defence*, all in ACO I. 1/6, 120–5.

103 At Constantinople II it was believed (wrongly) that Chalcedon had formally approved Cyril’s Chapters; see Price (2009) I, 66–71. This approval is taken here to extend to Cyril’s defence of the Chapters in response to Theodoret.

104 Cyril’s discussion of Mt 26:39a (‘Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me’) in his *Defence* of his Fourth Chapter is quoted below, pp. 367–8. It treats Christ’s self-emptying (Phil 2:7) in undergoing human experiences but does not mention his human will.

105 Sergius asserted ‘one will’ in the *Ekthesis* (p. 229 above), as did Pope Honorius in his First Letter to Sergius (ACO² II/2, p. 550, 16–17).

106 That is, human beings in the ‘flock’ of Christ.





meditate on them, to abide by them, and through them to enlighten and be enlightened. For it is by doing this that we save ourselves and shall benefit our hearers. Our zeal is for the ‘call above’,¹⁰⁷ where the accord of peace, rightly granted to those in the race of piety, bestows the frontal crown of glory.¹⁰⁸ We ‘have been made manifest to God’,¹⁰⁹ who tests and judges everything. We do not stand our ground contentiously or look to intrigue or cherish a vain partiality, but with the word of God we have provided an explanation of the question under investigation, [204] confident that God the lord of peace will preserve our unity and love for one another, to the glory of his all-good magnificence.

To all the brotherhood with your beatitude in Christ we and those with us send abundant greetings.

The subscription. While enjoying good health in the Lord, pray for us, most holy and most blessed brother.

{Transacted in the month of May in the third indiction.}¹¹⁰

Deusdedit bishop of Cagliari said:

In his letter, the one that has just been read to us, Bishop Paul of Constantinople has provided explicit proof of your holiness’s wise statement to the holy synod here present and confirmed the reports of those God-beloved men who brought an accusation against him before your apostolic see. For that he was admonished both orally and in writing by the apostolic high-priest before you and yet remained incorrigible and deaf to the adjurations they addressed to him concerning his stance, he acknowledged, as we have heard, by saying and writing, ‘For this reason we have perhaps put up with verbal buffets ... It is not good for those calumniated to calumniate in return ... lest we should enter on a competition in insults by replying to your letter in kind ... There is a time for speaking and a time for keeping silent ... Lord, you will open my lips and I shall utter a word in reply to those who reproach me ... God has opened for us the bars of speech through the arrival of the *apocrisarii* sent by your brotherly beatitude, who after many fruitless discussions with us about the church inquiry finally reached this

107 Phil 3:14.

108 Cp. 1 Cor 9:24–5.

109 2 Cor 5:11.

110 This date of May 645 is supplied from the Latin version. Winkelmann (2001) 121 judges it to be ‘certainly too early’, but it is accepted by both Riedinger (1976) 3–4, n. 3 and Jankowiak (2009) 214, n. 197.





point ... that we should explain the concept of one will in Christ our true God.'

We have therefore shown from what he wrote, as we have said, that he was canonically admonished by the apostolic injunctions and the God-beloved *apocrisarii* of your primatial see. Even though you, likewise, in the person of those who conveyed to him your admonitions, bore witness to his stance or innovation in many addresses to him, yet contrary to the canons he has remained wilfully deaf to them, wrongly considering these to be 'insults', 'calumnies', 'reproaches' and 'buffets', although they were saving and beneficial exhortations [206] addressed to him in kindness and solely for his betterment; for offering dissuasion from evil and persuasion to the better is wholly salutary for those who accept it. He did not bear in mind that wounds inflicted by a friend are more worthy of trust than the studied kisses of an enemy. For 'I have written to you,' says the divine apostle, 'with many tears, not in order that you should grieve, but that you may know the love which I bear in abundance towards you.'¹¹¹ If he had inscribed these things on the 'tablet of his heart',¹¹² he would have found favour for his good intentions before both God and men for rejecting his outlandish doctrines and adopting the pious doctrines of the catholic church. But because he recoiled from this and clung to his own notions, he in his letter has deprived himself of all excuse, by joining the others in confirming the *Ekthesis*, and with such zeal that in many parts of the letter it is presented in actual quotations, as he endeavours to maintain his accord and agreement with it to the extent of its very wording.

Now then that we have ascertained this precisely, come now, if it pleases your beatitude as well, and let us hear (through a copy) the purport of the *Typos*.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Let there be brought for our examination a copy of the *Typos* which was recently composed against the orthodox faith at the prompting of Paul bishop of Constantinople.

Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

¹¹¹ 2 Cor 2:4.

¹¹² Cp. 2 Cor 3:3.





262 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

I have brought a copy of the *Typos* as ordered by your beatitude, and have it to hand, for your good pleasure.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Let the copy of the *Typos* be taken and read in the presence of the holy synod, for a precise understanding of its purport.

And, taking it, Theodore, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out, translated from Greek into Latin:

[The *Typos*]

[208] Being accustomed to examine and investigate thoroughly everything that contributes to the benefit of our Christ-loving society and especially that relates to our unimpeachable faith, through which we trust that all will go well for us, we have learnt that our orthodox people are greatly perturbed by the fact that some affirm that there is one will in the incarnation of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ and that the same performs both what is divine and what is human,¹¹³ whereas others define two wills and two operations in the enfleshed dispensation of the Word; and while the former propound in their own defence, on account of 'one person', that our Lord Jesus Christ, while existing in two natures, wills and performs the divine and the human without either fusion or separation, the latter, on account of the natures that came together without separation in one and the same person, with their difference preserved and continuing, propound that the one and the same Christ performs both the divine and the human in parallel and in accordance with the natures. The consequence is that the people of our Christ-loving society are being led into great division and strife: because of their dissension, they cannot agree with one another, and as a result society is harmed in numerous ways. Guided by God Almighty, we deem it essential to quench the flame of discord that has been ignited in this way and allow it no longer to ravage the souls of men.

Therefore we decree that our subjects, those who persevere in orthodoxy, adhere to the pure faith of us Christians and belong to the catholic and apostolic church, are from now on to be denied the licence to conduct any

113 Both the affirmation of one will in Christ and the formula of each operation proceeding from the incarnate Word had occurred in the *Ekthesis* (p. 229).





dispute, contention or controversy with one another over one will or one operation or two operations and two wills. This we enact, not to abolish any at all of the pious dogmas of the holy and approved fathers concerning the enfleshed dispensation of God the Word, but with the intention of bringing to an end any further controversy over the aforesaid questions. [We enact] that on these matters there are to be followed and found sufficient solely the divine scriptures, the traditions of the holy five ecumenical councils, and the straightforwardly plain statements or expressions of the approved holy fathers, whose doctrines are the canons and laws of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church. Our subjects are to add nothing of their own to them, or delete anything, or interpret them in their own way, but the situation that existed previously before the development of controversy over the said questions is to be maintained everywhere, as if no quibbling had arisen over them. No one of all those who have hitherto taught one will and one operation or two wills and two operations is to be subjected to any censure or charge on this account, save for the heretics who have been rejected by the holy five ecumenical councils and the other orthodox and approved fathers together with their impious doctrines and writings, and those, to speak generally, who are repugnant and unacceptable to the holy catholic church. [210] For the sake of perfect union and universal harmony in the most holy churches of God, and to leave no occasion for those who wish to dispute endlessly, we have given orders for the removal of the documents treating the said questions that have previously been posted in the narthex of the most holy great church of this our God-protected and imperial city.¹¹⁴

Those who dare to transgress this will be subject in the first place to the judgement of the fearsome and almighty God, and are then to fear no slight imperial censure, by which, if they be bishops or clerics, they are to be deprived in every way of their priesthood and clerical rank, while if they be monks, they are to be excommunicated and expelled from their monasteries, and if they hold an honour or rank or government office, they are to be stripped of them. As for private citizens, if they belong to the nobility, they are to suffer the confiscation of their property, while if they are commoners, they are to be disciplined not only by corporal punishment but also by permanent exile, so that everyone, constrained by the fear of God and in dread of the penalties with which they are deservedly threatened, may keep untroubled and undisturbed the peace of God's holy churches.

114 Cp. the posting of Justinian's edict on the orthodox faith (551) in Hagia Sophia as mentioned in contemporary sources (Price (2009) I, 163, 167, 171).





The holy synod said:¹¹⁵

It is clear that the *Typos* that has just been read has an admirable aim, but its provisions do not accord with this aim, for while by common acknowledgement it is a good thing, desired by all who fear the Lord, to cease from discord and controversy over the faith, it is not a good thing to do so by suppressing the good together with the bad, or the statements and doctrines of the orthodox fathers together with those of the heretics. For this excites tension rather than putting a rightful stop to it, since no one will accept being denied the pious tenets of the faith as well as the impious ones of heresy; and it is equally wrong to approve the bad and to reject it indiscriminately together with the good, for both of these negate the principle of righteousness. For this reason the great Abraham, perplexed over the matter, approached God and said, 'Surely you shall not destroy the righteous with the impious, so that the righteous are like the impious? By no means should you act in this manner, to slay the righteous together with the impious, so that the righteous are like the impious. By no means! You who judge the whole world will not perform [this] judgement.'¹¹⁶ If indeed by scriptural proof or patristic teaching it had shown both [of these positions] to be equally blameworthy or praiseworthy, the *Typos* would have done well in attesting the censure of both by the utterances of the Spirit and of the fathers who were inspired by the Spirit, and in enacting for both either silence or, on the contrary, recognition for correct speech. But since it has totally failed to demonstrate either of these and has imposed a common silence on affirming that there are one, or two, wills and operations in Christ God, it is sufficient for us to adopt towards our most pious emperor the form of address that this patriarch had the boldness to use even to God the king of kings, [212] when he said, 'By no means should you act in this manner, to slay the righteous together with the impious, so that the righteous are like the impious. For the master of the universe has commanded us to 'turn from evil and do good',¹¹⁷ but neither to reject the good together with the bad nor issue a general commendation, since manifestly both are harmful when adopted, while only the very first is salutary when performed, I mean turning from evil and acknowledging the good. For God instructs us through Moses, 'Distinguish between the

115 The question who is speaking is immaterial, in that speeches of this kind in the Acts were literary compositions by Greek monks for subsequent publication and were probably not read out at the synod. See our discussion at pp. 66–7 above.

116 Gen 18:23, 25.

117 Ps 33:15.





profane and the holy and between the clean and the unclean; I am the Lord your God. And keep all my commandments, so as not to perform any of the precepts of abomination, because every human being who performs any of all these abominations will be utterly rooted out – the souls that perform it – from the midst of their people.¹¹⁸

Therefore what is necessary is not to attach censure indiscriminately to those who do not reject both equally – the assertion that Christ God has one or two operations or wills – but to apply it, as justice demands, only to those who do not acknowledge what is acknowledged by the God-approved fathers of the catholic church, namely that the essences or natures of the one and the same, united without fusion or separation, are two, and that likewise the wills and operations, I mean the divine and the human, are equal to the natures in number, and this applies especially to one who is endeavouring in imitation of God to achieve due precision in his decrees. Accordingly, as has already been said, we laud the aim of the *Typos*, since it is good, but we completely reject its means, since they do not accord with the aim, and are completely unacceptable to the pious rule of the catholic church, which rightly enjoins the suppression of the statements and doctrines of only her enemies, and not the denial together with them of those of the holy fathers, or the profession of both together. For the holy fifth council spoke as follows: ‘It is alien to Christians to receive impiety together with the orthodox faith and not to distinguish the correct from the bad, for what partnership is there between righteousness and iniquity, or what fellowship between light and darkness?’¹¹⁹ What accord is there between patristic teaching and heretical sophistry? For all heretical admixture is alien to the word of orthodoxy, which the Lord commands all to acknowledge inviolably in everlasting confession: ‘He who acknowledges me before men, I too shall acknowledge him before my Father in heaven, but he who denies me and my words, I too shall deny him before my Father in heaven.’¹²⁰

Since, therefore, we have judged this matter rightly, in such a way that we teach and acknowledge only the pious doctrines and statements of the holy fathers and councils, and neither class them together with the contrary ones for either approval or rejection, we must now examine the fact that Bishop Paul of Constantinople, by formerly confirming the *Ekthesis* in

118 Lev 10:10, 18:30, 18:29.

119 A free citation from the closing decree of Constantinople 553 (Price (2009) II, 118), where the context is an assertion that the Council of Chalcedon cannot possibly have approved the Letter of Ibas to Mari the Persian.

120 Mt 10:32–3.





writing and now prompting the publication of the *Typos*, has fulfilled the saying in Proverbs, 'A hard heart will be weighed down by affliction and a sinner [214] will add sin to sin',¹²¹ since he has not listened to the injunction, 'Do not repeat your sin, for even for one you will not escape punishment. Do not allow your mouth to make your tongue sin, and do not say before the face of God, "It is but ignorance," lest God be incensed by your speech. For many have been led astray by their assumptions, and by evil supposition their understanding suffered a fall.'¹²²

These quotations, or any one of them (I refer to those from the utterances of the Spirit that we offer in prudent exhortation for their salvation), neither Paul himself nor those like-minded (Cyrus, Pyrrhus and Sergius) reflected upon for the checking or correction of their errors; they thought nothing of a frivolous mockery of the divine mysteries of the catholic church or of rash infringement of the teaching of the fathers, as if the existence or non-existence of the gospel of our salvation lay with them. For accordingly, as we have heard and our hands have touched concerning the word of their innovation,¹²³ they defined at one time one operation and at another not even one operation at all, at one time one will and at another absolutely no will at all in Christ our God and Saviour, thereby stating that he is by nature without operation and without will, that is, without existence and without essence, in each of his natures, and not he alone but also God the Father and the Holy Spirit, since, speaking properly, each of them is by nature what Christ is as God by nature.¹²⁴ And something still more grave than this, and which confutes their lies even more, is the fact that, sealing their statement to this effect with an anathema against themselves, they declared in writing that our Lord and God Jesus Christ's having both one will and operation and none at all is the perfect, accurate, sure and flawless teaching and doctrine of all the holy fathers and the ecumenical five councils (as they have repeatedly asserted), not perceiving that they cancelled the one by means of the other, namely the one operation by their asserting no operation but defining that the will in Christ is one. And all this they have rescinded in their final *Typos*, so that they now have no idea at all what they believe or

121 Sir 3:27.

122 Sir. 7:8, Eccl 5:5, Sir 3:24.

123 A grotesque application of 1 Jn 1:1.

124 Cp. the *Disputation at Bizye* (in Allen and Neil (2002) 82–5), where Maximus argues that the *Ekthesis* by forbidding talk of either one or two operations denied Christ any operation, and that the *Typos* by forbidding talk of one or two wills deprived Christ in addition of all volition, reducing him to non-existence.





profess, as a result of the constant and rapid alteration or rejection of their own doctrines.¹²⁵ For ‘while he was still speaking,’ as Job says, ‘behold another messenger’,¹²⁶ to announce to them the annulment of their earlier doctrine, and yet another, to announce still more earnestly the annulment of the last, and yet another that of the other, and all of them that of all, as through a total estrangement from it they all alike cause in themselves a falling away from the true and ecclesiastical teaching. Because of this the Lord calls them wretched, when he says through the blessed Hosea, ‘Woe to them, for they have run away from me; wretched are they, for they have acted impiously towards me. I ransomed them, but they spoke lies against me, and as a man transgressing the covenant, so there they despised me.’¹²⁷

[216] Since we are investigating sacred matters in a sacred manner and both protect completely and vindicate the orthodox faith of the catholic church, come, let us in a coherent sequence, as we resolved, refute the lies of our opponents by recourse to the statements and definitions of fathers and councils, lest, through their asserting and writing ‘These are the doctrines of piety handed down by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word and by their disciples and successors in sequence, which is to say the holy and ecumenical five councils of the blessed fathers’,¹²⁸ they deceptively use such talk to seduce and beguile the more simple into turning to the bad as if it were the good, because of the reputable name of fathers and councils. From the beginning the serpent taught his disciples to do this in imitation of himself, so that through the specious appearance of concocted modes and expressions they may separate those they suborn from the living God. To overlook this would be perilous for us, for we have been entrusted by the Lord with shepherding the rational sheep and driving off and repelling the wolves, lest because of our neglect any of the nurslings of his catholic church become a prey.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God’s holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

According to the admirable request of the holy synod in session with us, let there first be brought by those who are devoutly assisting the

125 The monoenergism of Cyrus’ *Plerophoria* was rejected by the *Ekthesis*, and then the monotheletism of the *Ekthesis* was rescinded by the *Typos*.

126 Job 1:16–18.

127 Hos 7:13, 6:7.

128 From the *Ekthesis* (p. 229).





268 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

proceedings the definitions of the holy ecumenical councils, that is, their declarations and decrees.

Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

According to the command of your holiness I have brought from the holy archives the proceedings of the holy councils and have them to hand, for your good pleasure.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

From the volumes of each holy council that have been brought, let the pious declarations and decrees of the orthodox faith be read to us in order.

And, taking them, Paschalis, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out in the presence of all:

[218] The exposition of faith of the 318 holy fathers¹²⁹

We believe in one God the Father, the Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Jesus Christ our Lord,¹³⁰ the Son of God, begotten from the Father as only-begotten, that is, from the substance of the Father, God from God, light from light, true God from true God, begotten not made, consubstantial with the Father, through whom all things came into being, both those in the heavens and those on earth, who for us men and for our salvation came down, was incarnate and became man, suffered, rose on the third day, ascended into heaven, is seated at the right hand of the Father, and is coming again with glory to judge the living and the dead; and in the Holy Spirit. Those who say, 'There was when he was not,' and 'Before being begotten he was not,' and that he came into being from things that are not, or say that the Son of God is from another hypostasis or substance or is changeable or alterable, these the catholic and apostolic church anathematises.

129 This version of the Nicene Creed contains some additions to the original text, notably 'is seated at the right hand of the Father' and 'again in glory', taken from the Creed of Constantinople.

130 The original Nicene Creed had 'one Lord Jesus Christ'. The addition of 'our' (as also in the citation below of the Creed of Constantinople) had occurred previously in the citation of the Creed of Constantinople in the text of the Chalcedonian Definition included in the Acts of Constantinople II (Price (2009) II, 62).





The exposition of faith of 150 holy fathers assembled at
Constantinople¹³¹

We believe in one God the Father, the Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Jesus Christ our Lord, the only-begotten Son of God, who was begotten from the Father before all ages, true God from true God, begotten not made, consubstantial with the Father, through whom all things came into being, both those in heaven and those on earth, who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, was incarnate from the Holy Spirit and Mary the Virgin and became man, was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate and suffered, rose on the third day, ascended into heaven, is seated at the right hand of the Father, and is coming again with glory to judge the living and the dead, of whose kingdom there will not be an end; and in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the life-giver, who proceeds from the Father, who with the Father and the Son is co-worshipped and co-glorified, who spoke through the holy prophets; and in one catholic and apostolic church. I¹³² profess one baptism for the remission of sins. I await the resurrection of the dead and the life of the age to come.

The chapters on the faith by the blessed Cyril bishop of Alexandria which the holy council of 200 holy fathers approved in his time.¹³³

1. If anyone does not profess that Emmanuel is truly God and that therefore the holy Virgin is Theotokos (for she gave fleshly birth to the Word from God made flesh), let him be anathema.

2. [220] If anyone does not profess that the Word from God the Father was united to the flesh hypostatically and that Christ is one with his own flesh, the same manifestly being both God and man, let him be anathema.

3. If anyone in respect of the one Christ separates the hypostases

131 This version of the Creed of Constantinople slightly abbreviates the original, omitting 'of heaven and earth' (after 'maker'), 'light from light', and 'according to the scriptures'.

132 The singular ('I' rather than 'we'), here and in 'I await', marks an unusual adaptation of the text to suit individual profession, as in a baptismal context. The Latin version keeps to the plural.

133 The heading in the Latin version is 'The Symbol [= Creed] at Ephesus of the 200 Fathers', a striking testimony to the exalted status this text achieved as a result of its re-evaluation in the sixth century (see Price (2009) I, 66–71). Its status at Ephesus itself was unclear: it was included in the acts of the first session of the council but without explicit endorsement of its contents; however, the Syrian bishops, who arrived soon afterwards, insisted that this session had approved Cyril's Chapters (e.g. ACO I. 4, p. 44, 36–7). See de Halleux (1992).





270 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

after the union, joining them in mere conjunction according to dignity or authority or lordship and not rather by a coming together in natural union, let him be anathema.

4. If anyone ascribes to two persons or hypostases the sayings in the gospels and apostolic writings, whether spoken by the saints with reference to Christ or by him about himself, and attributes some to a man considered individually apart from the Word from God and some, as divine, only to the Word from God the Father, let him be anathema.

5. If anyone dares to say that Christ is a God-bearing man and not rather that he is truly God as the one Son even by nature, since the Word became flesh and shared like us in blood and flesh,¹³⁴ let him be anathema.

6. If anyone says that the Word from God the Father is the God or master of Christ, and does not rather profess that the same is both God and man, since the Word became flesh according to the scriptures,¹³⁵ let him be anathema.

7. If anyone says that Jesus was inspired as a man by God the Word and that the glory of the Only-begotten was assigned as to another existing beside him, let him be anathema.

8. If anyone dares to say that the man taken up must be co-worshipped and co-glorified together with God the Word and co-named God as one with another (for the constant addition of 'co-' compels this interpretation) and does not rather honour Emmanuel with a single worship and ascribe a single doxology to him, since the Word became flesh, let him be anathema.

9. If anyone says that the one Lord Jesus Christ was glorified by the Spirit, as if he used the power through him as something that was another's and received from him the ability to operate against unclean spirits and to perform miracles upon men, and does not rather say that the Spirit through whom he worked the miracles was his own, let him be anathema.

10. Divine scripture says that Christ became 'the high priest and apostle of our confession',¹³⁶ and he proffered himself for us in the odour of sweetness to God the Father.¹³⁷ If therefore anyone says that it was not the Word from God himself who became our high priest and apostle when he became flesh and man like us, but a man from woman as an individual other than him, or if anyone says that he made the offering on his own

134 Cp. Heb 2:14.

135 Cp. Jn 1:14.

136 Heb 3:1

137 Cp. Eph 5:2.





behalf and not rather for us alone (for he who knew not sin would not have needed to make an offering), let him be anathema.

11. [222] If anyone does not profess that the flesh of the Lord is life-giving and belongs to the very Word from God the Father, but [professes that it belongs] to someone other than him, joined to him in dignity and possessing no more than divine indwelling, and not rather that it is life-giving because, as we have said, it came into being as belonging to the Word who has the power to give life to all things, let him be anathema.

12. If anyone does not profess that the Word of God suffered in the flesh and was crucified in the flesh and tasted death in the flesh and became ‘the firstborn from the dead,’¹³⁸ since he is life and life-giving as God, let him be anathema.

The Definition of the holy council at Chalcedon

This wise and saving symbol of divine grace¹³⁹ should indeed be sufficient for the perfect knowledge and confirmation of piety, for on the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit its teaching is complete, while to those who receive it faithfully it also sets forth the incarnation of the Lord. Nevertheless those who attempt to set at nought the preaching of the truth by heresies of their own have propagated nonsense, some having dared to destroy the mystery of the dispensation of the Lord on our behalf and denying to the Virgin the name of Theotokos, while others, introducing merger and mixture, mindlessly invent that there is one nature of flesh and Godhead, and through this merger fantasise that the divine nature of the Only-begotten is possible. For this reason, wishing to close off from them every device against the truth, this holy, great and ecumenical council now present, expounding the firmness of the proclamation from of old, has decreed first and foremost that the creed of the 318 holy fathers is to remain inviolate. Furthermore, it confirms the teaching on the essence of the Holy Spirit that was handed down at a later date by the 150 fathers who assembled in the imperial city because of those who were fighting the Holy Spirit; this teaching they made known to all, not as though they were inserting something omitted by their predecessors, but rather making clear by scriptural testimony the latter’s conception of the Holy Spirit against those who were trying to annul his

138 Col 1:18.

139 In the full text (Price and Gaddis (2005) II, 201–5) this follows immediately a citation of the creed in both its Nicene and Constantinopolitan forms.





sovereignty. And because of those who attempt to destroy the mystery of the dispensation, shamelessly blathering that he who was born of the Holy Virgin Mary is a mere human being, the council has accepted as in keeping [with these creeds] the synodical letters of the blessed Cyril, then shepherd of the church of Alexandria, to Nestorius and to those of the east, for the refutation of the insanity of Nestorius and for the instruction of those who with pious zeal desire to know the meaning of the saving symbol. To these letters it has attached appropriately, for the confirmation of the orthodox doctrines, the letter written by the president of the great and Elder Rome, the most blessed and most holy archbishop Leo, to the sainted archbishop Flavian for the confutation of the perversity of Eutyches, since it accords with the profession of the great Peter and is a universal pillar against those with false beliefs. For the council sets itself against those who attempt to rend the mystery of the dispensation into a duality of sons, and [224] it expels from the list of priests those who dare to say that the Godhead of the Only-begotten is passible; it opposes those who imagine mixture or fusion in the case of the two natures of Christ, it expels those who rave that the form of a servant which he took from us was heavenly or of some other substance, and it anathematises those who invent two natures of the Lord before the union and imagine one nature after the union.

Following, therefore, the holy fathers, we all in harmony teach profession of one and the same Son our Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead and the same perfect in manhood, truly God and the same truly man, of a rational soul and a body, consubstantial with the Father in respect of the Godhead, and the same consubstantial with us in respect of the manhood, like us in all things apart from sin, begotten from the Father before the ages in respect of the Godhead, and the same in the last days for us and for our salvation from the Virgin Mary the Theotokos in respect of the manhood, one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, acknowledged in two natures without fusion, change, division, or separation – the difference of the natures being in no way destroyed by the union, but instead the particularity of each nature being preserved and coming together into one person and one hypostasis – not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son, Only-begotten, God, Word, Lord, Jesus Christ, as from of old the prophets and Jesus Christ himself taught us about him, and the symbol of the fathers has handed down to us.

Now that these matters have been formulated by us with all possible care and precision, the holy and ecumenical council hereby decrees that no one is allowed to produce or compose or construct another creed or to think





or teach otherwise. As for those who dare either to construct another creed or to produce or teach or deliver another symbol to those wishing to convert to the knowledge of the truth from paganism or Judaism or from any heresy whatsoever, these, if they are bishops or clerics, are to be deposed, bishops from the episcopate and clerics from the clerical state, while, if they are monks or laymen, they are to be anathematised.

The Definition in chapters of the holy fifth council under Justinian of divine memory assembled at Constantinople¹⁴⁰

1. If anyone does not profess one nature or essence and one power and authority of Father and Son and Holy Spirit, a consubstantial Trinity, one Godhead worshipped in three hypostases or persons, let him be anathema. For 'there is one God and Father from whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ through whom are all things,'¹⁴¹ and one Holy Spirit in whom are all things.

2. [226] If anyone does not profess that God the Word had two births, one before the ages from the Father timelessly and incorporeally, and the other, in the last days, of the same who came down from heaven and was incarnate from the holy and glorious Mother of God and ever-virgin Mary and was born from her, let him be anathema.

3. If anyone says that God the Word who worked miracles was someone other than the Christ who suffered, or says that God the Word was with the Christ born from woman, or was in him as in someone other than himself, but does not say that he is one and the same Jesus Christ our Lord, the Word of God incarnate and made man, and that of the same are the miracles and the sufferings that he voluntarily underwent in the flesh, let him be anathema.

4. If anyone says that it was according to grace or operation or dignity or equal honour or authority or reference or relation or power that the union of God the Word with man took place or according to good pleasure, as if God the Word was pleased with the man as a result of having an excellent opinion of him, as Theodore states in his madness, or according to homonymy, by which the Nestorians, by calling God the Word 'Jesus' and 'Christ' and separately calling the man 'Christ' and 'Son' and openly saying 'two persons', say deceptively that there is one person and one Christ only in respect of title and honour and merit and worship, but does

140 For notes on these canons see Price (2009) II, 103–5, 120–6.

141 1 Cor 8:6.





not profess that the union of God the Word with flesh ensouled by a rational and intellectual soul took place by composition or hypostatically, as the holy fathers taught, and that as result his hypostasis¹⁴² is one, which is our Lord Jesus Christ, one of the Holy Trinity, let him be anathema. For with the union being understood in many ways, those who follow the impiety of Apollinarius and Eutyches, insisting on the disappearance of [the elements] that came together, advocate union by fusion, while those who hold the tenets of Theodore and Nestorius, rejoicing in division, introduce the notion that the union is relational. But the holy church of God, rejecting the impiety of both heresies, professes that the union of God the Word with the flesh was by composition, that is, hypostatic; for the union by composition in the mystery of Christ not only preserves the elements that came together without fusion but also excludes division.

5. If anyone so understands the one hypostasis of our Lord Jesus Christ as allowing the meaning of many hypostases, and tries thereby to introduce in the case of the mystery of Christ two hypostases or two persons, and in relation to the two persons that he is introducing speaks of one person according to merit and honour and worship, as the insane Theodore and Nestorius wrote, and misrepresents the holy council at Chalcedon as using the term 'one hypostasis' according to this impious conception, but does not profess that the Word of God was united to flesh hypostatically, and [228] that therefore he has one hypostasis and one person, and that the holy council at Chalcedon professed one hypostasis of our Lord Jesus Christ in this way, let him be anathema. For the Holy Trinity received no addition of person or hypostasis even after the incarnation of God the Word, one of the Holy Trinity.

6. If anyone says that it is catachrestically but not truly that the holy and glorious ever-virgin Mary is Mother of God, or by transference, as if a mere man was born [from her] and God the Word was not incarnate from her, the birth of the man having reference, according to them, to God the Word as being with the man who was being born, and misrepresents the holy council at Chalcedon as having called the Virgin 'Mother of God' [*Theotokos*] according to this impious interpretation thought up by Theodore, or if anyone calls her 'mother of the man' [*anthropotokos*] or 'mother of Christ' [*Christotokos*] as if Christ was not God, but does not

142 The original Latin version of the canons of 553 (though not the Latin version here) has 'composite hypostasis', which was probably in the original Greek text, though lacking in all our Greek witnesses. See Price (2009) II, 121, n. 71.





profess that she is properly and truly Mother of God because God the Word, born from the Father before the ages, was in the last days incarnate and born from her, and that this is how the holy council at Chalcedon piously professed her to be Mother of God, let him be anathema.

7. If anyone saying 'in two natures' does not profess the one Jesus Christ our Lord to be acknowledged in Godhead and manhood, in order to signify by this the difference of the natures from which the ineffable union took place without fusion, and without either the Word being changed into the nature of the flesh or the flesh transformed into the nature of the Word (for each remains what it is by nature even after the hypostatic union) but understands this expression in respect of the mystery of Christ in terms of a division into parts or, while professing the number of natures in respect of the same, one, our Lord, Jesus Christ, God the Word incarnate, does not understand the difference of these [elements] from which he was compounded to be in perception alone, a difference that is not destroyed by the union (for he is one from both, and both through one), but uses number for this end, alleging that the natures are separate and self-subsistent, let him be anathema.

8. If anyone professing that the union took place from the two natures of Godhead and manhood or saying 'one incarnate nature of God the Word' does not so take it, as the holy fathers taught, to mean that from the divine and the human natures, after the hypostatic union, one Christ was constituted, but attempts from these statements to introduce one nature or essence of the Godhead and flesh of Christ, let him be anathema. For when we say that the only-begotten Word was united to the flesh hypostatically we do not assert that there occurred some mingling of the natures with each other, but we understand that the Word was united to the flesh with each of them remaining instead what is. Consequently there is but one Christ God and man, the same consubstantial with the Father in respect of the Godhead and the same consubstantial with us in respect of the manhood; for both those who divide or cleave into parts and those who fuse the mystery of the divine dispensation of Christ are equally rejected and anathematised by the church of God.

9. [230] If someone says that Christ is worshipped in two natures, whereby two forms of worship are introduced, of the God the Word separately and of the man separately, or if someone with a view to abolishing the flesh or fusing the Godhead and the manhood proposes the fantastic theory of one nature or essence of the elements that came together and worships Christ accordingly, but does not worship with a single worship





God the Word incarnate together with his own flesh, as the church of God received from the beginning, let him be anathema.

10. If anyone does not profess that our Lord Jesus Christ, crucified in the flesh, is true God and Lord of glory and one of the Holy Trinity, let him be anathema.

11. If anyone does not anathematise Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinarius, Nestorius, Eutyches and Origen, with their impious writings, and all the other heretics condemned and anathematised by the holy catholic and apostolic church and by the aforesaid holy four councils, and those who held or hold tenets like those of the aforesaid heretics and persisted in their impiety till death, let him be anathema.

12. If anyone defends the impious Theodore of Mopsuestia, who said that God the Word is someone other than Christ, who was troubled by the passions of the soul and the desires of the flesh, was gradually separated from that which is worse and so became better by progress in works and was made faultless by his way of life, and that he was baptised as a mere man in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, received through baptism the grace of the Holy Spirit, was honoured with sonship, was worshipped as representing God the Word, on the level of an image of the emperor, and after his resurrection became immutable in his thoughts and totally sinless – furthermore the same impious Theodore said that the union of God the Word with Christ was of the same kind as that which the apostle ascribed to man and woman, ‘The two will become one flesh’,¹⁴³ and in addition to his other innumerable blasphemies he dared to assert that, when after the resurrection the Lord breathed on his disciples and said, ‘Receive the Holy Spirit’,¹⁴⁴ he did not give them the Holy Spirit but breathed on them only in semblance; and, as for the profession of Thomas, when he touched the Lord’s hands and side after the resurrection, namely ‘My Lord and my God’,¹⁴⁵ he asserted that this was not said by Thomas about Christ (for he says that Christ himself was not God) but that Thomas, amazed at the extraordinary character of the resurrection, was praising God for raising up Christ; and what is even worse is that in the commentary he composed on the Acts of the Apostles the same Theodore, comparing Christ to Plato, Mani, Epicurus and Marcion, says that just as each of these men, having devised his own teaching, caused his disciples to be called

143 Eph 5:31.

144 Jn 20:22.

145 Jn 20:28.





Platonists, Manichaeans, Epicureans and Marcionites, so in the same way when Christ had devised his teaching ‘Christians’ were called after him; [232] if anyone therefore defends the said most impious Theodore and his impious writings, in which he poured forth both the aforesaid blasphemies and innumerable others against our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ, and if he does not anathematise him and his impious writings and all those who accept or defend him or assert that his teaching was orthodox, both those who wrote in his support and held the same tenets as he and also those who write in support of him and his impious writings, as well as those who hold or ever held tenets like his and who persisted or persist in this impiety till death: let him be anathema.

13. If anyone defends the impious writings of Theodoret against the orthodox faith and the first holy council at Ephesus and the sainted Cyril and his Twelve Chapters, and everything that he wrote in support of the impious Theodore and Nestorius and of the others who held the same tenets as the aforesaid Theodore and Nestorius, and who accepted¹⁴⁶ them and their impiety and therefore calls impious the teachers of the church who profess that the union of God the Word with the flesh was hypostatic, and does not anathematise the said impious writings and those who held or hold tenets like his, and all those who wrote against the orthodox faith or against the sainted Cyril and his Twelve Chapters, and who died in this impiety: let him be anathema.

14. If anyone defends the letter that is said to have been written by Ibas to Mari the Persian, which denies that God the Word was incarnate and became man from the holy Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary, and says that there was born from her a mere man, whom it calls the temple, making out God the Word to be someone other than the man, and charges the sainted Cyril, who proclaimed the orthodox faith of Christians, with being a heretic and having written like the impious Apollinarius, and accuses the first holy council at Ephesus of deposing Nestorius without trial and examination – the same impious letter calls the Twelve Chapters of the sainted Cyril impious and contrary to the orthodox faith and defends Theodore and Nestorius and their impious doctrines and writings –; if anyone therefore defends the said impious letter and does not anathematise both it and those who defend it and assert that it, or a part of it, is orthodox, and who wrote or write in support of it or the impieties contained in it, and dare to defend

¹⁴⁶ Here the Latin translation (*recipit*) reflects a different Greek reading. See Price (2009) II, 125, n. 94.





it or the impieties contained in it in the name of the holy fathers or of the holy council at Chalcedon, and who persisted in this till death: let him be anathema.

Now therefore that we have professed these things in this way, which we also received from divine scripture, the teaching of the holy fathers, and the definitions about the one and the same faith by the aforesaid holy four councils, and now that we have also issued a condemnation against the heretics and of their impiety and also of those who have defended or defend the aforesaid Three Chapters and have persevered or persevere [234] in their deviation, if anyone attempts to transmit, teach or write what is contrary to our pious decrees, if he is a bishop or enrolled in the clergy, he will be stripped of his episcopal or clerical rank for doing what is alien for priests and to ecclesiastical order, while if he is a monk or layman he will be anathematised.

Maximus the most holy bishop of Aquileia said:

It is necessary, as it is lawful, for the disciples of the Lord to imitate the Lord in every word and deed. Accordingly it is appropriate for us to say on behalf of the holy ecumenical five councils what the Lord said of himself, ‘The ruler of this world is coming and in me he will find nothing,’¹⁴⁷ because along came the originators of this innovation, namely Cyrus and Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul, and in us they found nothing of their own, even if they endeavoured against reason to misrepresent us in this, as heretics are wont to do, attempting to disguise their own malice in order to hide the truth with lies and so reveal the father of lies, pursuing with their help his operation against the faith. The holy evangelist John indicated this in his general epistle, for our protection: ‘Who is the liar but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ? This is the Antichrist, and just as you have heard that Antichrist is coming, so now there are many Antichrists.’¹⁴⁸ Exposing this ‘liar’, namely the doctrine that opposes his perfect incarnation, the Lord said, ‘When you see the abomination of desolation in the holy place, may he who reads understand.’¹⁴⁹ The ‘holy place’ is every pious doctrine and definition about his incarnation that was piously proclaimed by the holy fathers; so it is in it that those who oppose it through innovation contrive somehow to counterfeit and don it, saying, ‘We are those who have the true faith of

147 Jn 14:30.

148 1 Jn 2:22,18.

149 Mt 24:15.





the holy councils and fathers,' like the evil one saying 'I am the Christ'¹⁵⁰ to mislead his hearers. But 'may he who reads', it says, 'understand': for just as it is necessary for the refutation of the Antichrist to read the holy scriptures (for by announcing it in advance they pillory his deceit), so for the refutation of the heretics it is necessary to read the teachings of the approved fathers and councils. For these expose for us their heresy, and having read them just now, we recognise, as you know, most blessed one, the violent assault committed against them by their opponents, lawlessly perpetrated in the garden of the catholic church, where the purity of pious confession is performed by all through the oil of anointing in the Spirit.¹⁵¹

So we too cry out to God together with the blessed Susannah against the lawless elders in defence of the aforesaid holy five councils, 'Eternal God, the discernor of secrets who knows everything before it comes to be, you know that a false accusation has been brought [236] against us by Cyrus and Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul.'¹⁵² Because of this, God roused the holy spirit of a zealous man whose name was Martin, who has convened us devoutly and presides over us apostolically. He has cried out with a loud voice, saying, 'I am innocent of the doctrine of this innovation; let us all return to the judgement-seat and examine their words, for they have used this innovation to bring false witness against the holy councils.'¹⁵³ In his examination, as you observe, he has separated them from each other, distinguishing the writing of each person, and has convicted them out of their own mouths¹⁵⁴ for not only overthrowing their own doctrines but also bringing charges against the holy five councils themselves, which defined none of the things that they have impiously laid down as dogma. Therefore we (the whole synod in harmony) bless God who saves those who hope in him, because by the hand of his servant, that is to say by the canonical power and authority granted to the latter by the Spirit, he has done to them what they wickedly planned to do against the catholic church.¹⁵⁵

We all join him in decreeing their condemnation on this account, since, as the statements and definitions of the holy five councils have testified,

150 Mt 24:5.

151 Cp. Sus I:15–17.

152 Cp. Sus I:42–3.

153 Cp. Sus I:45–6, 49.

154 Cp. Sus I:51, 61.

155 Cp. Sus I:60–1. Just as Daniel in the biblical story had refuted the false accusation of the two elders by getting them to contradict each other, so Martin had refuted the heretics' false account of the councils by showing how they had contradicted each other.





these councils proclaimed neither one will nor one operation, nor again did they in any way decree the abolition of the two wills and operations in Christ God, as these men have falsely charged. On the contrary, the holy councils condemned every heresy of those who fantastically asserted one will and operation in Christ God, namely Arius, Eudoxius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinarius¹⁵⁶ and all their impious writings, and rightly condemned together with them the abominable heretics who concurred with them in this (namely one will and operation), I mean Theodore and Nestorius, for vainly asserting that the union of God the Word with man occurred according to grace and according to operation, dignity and equality of honour, identity of will and authority, reference and power, relation, good pleasure and homonymy;¹⁵⁷ it was because of this (namely on account of the union) that each of them in harmony defined one operation and will, both those who fused and those who divided the great mystery of the dispensation (those who fused it because of their senseless doctrine of one composite nature, and those who divided it because of their futile notion of equality of honour and identity of will and authority), as a result of which both fell away from the true proclamation. It is therefore patent and acknowledged by all that their doctrines were in no way upheld by the holy ecumenical five councils, which anathematised in writing their works and their impious profession, even if Cyrus and Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul, the authors of the outlandish innovation, have had the temerity to accuse them falsely of teaching these things. For if the holy councils were to build up again what they had destroyed, they would become, instead, transgressors of their own divine decrees, as the divine Paul bears witness.¹⁵⁸

[238] If, therefore, so far from transgressing their own pious definitions, they justly anathematised the heretics who assert one will and operation in Christ God through senselessly laying down that our Lord and God is without mind and soul or is a mere man, then Cyrus and Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul, who proclaimed and acknowledged in their writings one will and operation in Christ God (they too agreeing with the heretics before them), are themselves, on account of a similar and identical heresy, anathematised together with the said heretics by the holy and ecumenical five councils,

156 Eudoxius of Germanicia was an Homoean (deemed Arian by his opponents) and Eunomius an Anomoean (radical Arian); Macedonius was charged with denying the divinity of the Holy Spirit and Apollinarius with denying Christ a human mind. The doctrines of all four were condemned at the First Council of Constantinople (381).

157 This follows closely Canon 4 of Constantinople II, given above (p. 273).

158 Cp. Gal 2:18.





as expounders of a novel faith; and consequently, because of their rash transgression of what these had synodically decreed, they have incurred the deposition laid down by them as the penalty for transgressors. For, as we have read, the holy and ecumenical council of the glorious fathers of Chalcedon 'decreed that no one is allowed to produce or compose or construct another creed or to think or teach otherwise; as for those who dare either to construct another creed or to produce or teach or deliver another symbol to those wishing to convert to the knowledge of the truth from paganism or Judaism or from any heresy whatsoever, these, if they are bishops or clerics, are to be deposed, bishops from the episcopate and clerics from the clerical state, while, if they are monks or laymen, they are to be anathematised.' There accords with this the decree of the holy fifth council, which says at the end of its chapters, 'Now that we have professed these things in this way, which we also received from divine scripture, the teaching of the holy fathers, and the definitions concerning the one and the same faith by the aforesaid holy four councils ... if anyone has attempted to transmit, teach or write what is contrary to our pious decrees, if he be a bishop or enrolled in the clergy, he will be stripped of his episcopal or clerical rank for doing what is alien for priests and to ecclesiastical order, while if he is a monk or layman he will be anathematised.'

Since therefore Cyrus and Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul have fallen subject to the synodical censure of the holy fathers because of their heresy, their case is not assisted but rather damaged by their calumny against the holy councils, because they have drawn on themselves, together with condemnation for heresy, a conviction for false testimony; for the holy councils did not define what these men have written, but anathematised what they in their ignorance laid down as dogma, together with the heretics Arius and Apollinarius, Theodore and Nestorius. For they refused to grasp or profess in word and thought, according to the holy councils, 'the same perfect in Godhead and the same perfect in manhood, truly God and the same truly man, of a rational soul and a body, consubstantial with the Father in respect of the Godhead, and the same consubstantial with us in respect of the manhood, like us in all things apart from sin, begotten from the Father before the ages in respect of the Godhead, and the same in the last days for us and for our salvation from Mary [240] the ever-virgin and Mother of God in respect of the manhood, one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, made known in two natures without fusion, change, division, or separation, the difference of the natures being in no way destroyed by the union, but rather the distinctive character of each nature





being preserved and coming together into one person and one hypostasis.¹⁵⁹ They never held properly or truly any of these pious doctrines, for how and in what way can be preserved or understood according to them the affirmation that the same is 'like us in all things apart from sin', when they deny and abolish both his divine and his human will and operation according to nature? How can 'the same be perfect' in each nature? How can he be 'truly God and truly man'? How can he 'preserve' without defect the natural 'particularity of each nature', when, as has already been said, these men have lopped his natural wills and operations? For it is impossible for these statements to remain in their totality or be professed by them if they annul any of them by silence. In consequence, to hide their own error they are committing the deceit described by Gregory the Theologian when writing to Cledonius: 'Whenever they are refuted and hard pressed by the common notions about the incarnation presented by scripture, they acknowledge the pious expressions but falsify their meaning, professing that the man is not without soul or reason or mind or imperfect, but slipping in the Godhead as soul, reason and mind, as if it alone had been mixed with the flesh, and not what is ours and human as well, even though the freedom from sin was more potent than in our case and cleansed him of our passions.'¹⁶⁰ For in their agreement with Arius and Apollinarius, Theodore and Nestorius they impiously define the 'perfect man' not as one tempted in everything that is ours apart from sin alone,¹⁶¹ but as one without natural will and operation. They are not alarmed by the fact that it is clear to all that they are calumniating the holy ecumenical five councils, but even when convicted by them they remain incorrigible, simulating piety in their words while falsifying the meaning, and in consequence they profess that the same is perfect in each nature, but without a substantial operation and will in either of the natures from which he is constituted.

Whenever we pillory their falsifying of the meaning in this way, they proceed to hide the fact of their simulation and openly reject the holy fathers themselves. That they do this without shame is testified by Cyrus of Alexandria, when writing as follows to Sergius of Constantinople about Sophronius of blessed memory: 'When there was inserted in the chapters that were issued a statement that it is necessary to affirm one operation in our Lord Jesus Christ, it offended him, since he asserts that one should

159 From the Chalcedonian Definition (p. 272 above).

160 Gregory Nazianzen, *ep.* 102.8–9 (SC 208, p. 74), criticising the Apollinarians.

161 Heb 4:15.





affirm two operations, and he has produced passages from various holy fathers.¹⁶² Note how Cyrus acknowledged what he communicated to Sergius in his own letter, that the sainted Sophronius ‘had produced passages from various holy fathers’ for him to the effect that [242] one should affirm two operations in Christ God. Having received exact information of this and yet despite this knowledge proceeding to criticise and discard the statements of the holy fathers, in an open rejection of the holy fathers themselves (as has just been said), they wrote a discourse on this in their *Ekthesis*, and confirmed it in the minutes of their proceedings: ‘Likewise the phrase “two operations” scandalises many, and we give no permission to anyone at all to assert two operations in the divine incarnation of the Lord.’¹⁶³ Here they follow and concur in all respects with the heretic Severus, since he too, when refuted by the statements of the fathers, rejected the holy fathers and their pious statements, writing as follows to Nephalius, ‘Asserting two natures in Christ is burdened by every censure, even if it was asserted by many of the fathers. So do not tell me again that the expression “two natures” was used by some of the fathers, for this expression was rejected by still more, even if the statements were to be by Cyril himself.’¹⁶⁴

Since one and the same heresy can be recognised in both, I mean Severus and the authors of the innovation, how could the shameless fruit of it not exist in both, I mean the denial of the holy fathers? For he who denies their pious statements is denied by them. Both Severus (even though he used the heretic Nestorius to cloak his impiety, claiming that it was because of him that he rejected a duality of natures in Christ and professed one nature) and the authors of this innovation were completely adrift in this frigid and senseless excuse. For none of the heretics (lest these men be able to claim that they reject the expressions of the fathers because of them) acknowledged a duality of wills and operations in Christ God, since this is in fact a refutation of their futile heresy, but this orthodox declaration is only to be found in the teaching of the holy fathers. Nevertheless, it is

162 From an otherwise unattested letter of Cyrus to Sergius. For Sophronius’ compilation of a vast dyoenergist florilegium see Stephen of Dora at p. 144 above.

163 A conflation of two separate sentences in the *Ekthesis* (p. 229 above).

164 This passage from Severus of Antioch’s *or.* 1 to Nephalius is cited in other works, including Leontius of Jerusalem, *Against the Monophysites* (PG 86B. 1841D–1844A) and Anastasius of Sinai, *Hodegos* (VII.1.13–23; CCSG 8, p. 104). The last part of the quotation should run, ‘When in the time of the holy Cyril the disease of Nestorius’ foolish babble was spreading in the churches, the expression [two natures] was more and more rejected, for diseases have their remedies. The statements of other fathers have no weight against the holy Cyril ... I would say more – even if the statements he cited were from Cyril himself.’





necessary to examine the matter closely. If, as they assert, the doctrines of their *Ekthesis* are those of all the approved fathers and councils, to which or to what sort of persons, then, do they attribute the doctrine they annul, about which they have written, ‘Even if it was used by some of the fathers, nevertheless, because it alienates and upsets the hearing of some ... we allow no one to profess it’?¹⁶⁵ For it is impossible, following the wilful error of the heretics, both to approve and to reject the doctrines of the holy fathers. And if it is impossible – and they have repudiated, ‘because it alienates and upsets them’, what they attributed to the fathers (even if this attribution is false) – surely they do not then confirm but rather negate that which they judged to be the teaching of the fathers. And if they negate it, how can they say, ‘These doctrines of piety were handed down to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and servants of the word’?¹⁶⁶ Therefore it is plain from their own senseless assertions that, as the argument has demonstrated, [244] they approved nothing from the fathers and that these are *not*, as in their invention, ‘the doctrines of the catholic church’. This is why they utterly failed to cite the testimony of an approved father both in their *Ekthesis* and in their proceedings in their support. They were utterly unable to, because all the holy fathers condemn it as alien to the orthodox teaching that is to be found in them. By mentioning only Nestorius as sharing their opinions (in explicit proof of their agreement with him), they revealed to all that he is the canon and teacher of their profession; the reason for their professing one will in our Lord Jesus Christ true God is, as they admit, that ‘the abominable Nestorius believed in an identity of volition’ – meaning one will – ‘in the two persons he invented’.¹⁶⁷

Having therefore found Cyrus and Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul in total agreement with the heretics who erred through either fusion or separation, we find them yet more shameless than the latter in their misinterpretation of the statement of the blessed Leo. It is known that the statement ‘For each form in communion with the other operates what is proper to it’ occurs in the letter he wrote to the sainted Flavian, which the holy council at Chalcedon described as being ‘for the confutation of the perversity of Eutyches’ and which ‘it attached appropriately, for the confirmation of the orthodox doctrines, since it accords with the profession of the great Peter

165 The words with which the *Ekthesis* (p. 229) criticises the doctrine of one operation in Christ.

166 Again from the *Ekthesis* (p. 229).

167 Ibid. The argument in the *Ekthesis* that not even Nestorius had dared to assert two wills is exploited to support a claim that the monothelites were disciples of Nestorius.





and is a universal pillar against those with false beliefs.¹⁶⁸ Yet they, in their madness, claimed that this sacred statement of the teacher signifies one operation in the Lord, neither respecting the holy fathers on this subject nor attending to the senseless heretics, [both of whom recognised] that it means, as is generally acknowledged, that there are two operations in Christ God in a union without fusion or separation, with the former piously approving this statement and the latter impiously condemning it. The authors of the innovation were not unaware of this, but they attempted to use this to reject the blessed council at Chalcedon and to slander the sainted Leo, as a result (as has already been said) of the extreme shamelessness that resulted from their rashness.

But since in their writings they inflicted the same calumny on all the other holy fathers as well, declaring that all the holy fathers shared their own impious opinions, it is necessary for us to bring the present session to a close at this point, that is, after what has been said at length with the help of God in defence of the holy five councils, and then in another session to bring the all-sacred books of the other holy fathers, as we resolved, so that through their blessed reading we may refute both canonically and synodically the false allegations made by our opponents against them, for the vindication of their pious and salvific teaching.

168 From the Chalcedonian Definition, p. 272 above.





THE FIFTH SESSION

SUMMARY¹

[250] The fifth act publishes the teaching of the holy fathers, and makes known to all by what they piously handed down to us that the heretics have held nothing at all of what the holy fathers preached. It presents the profane statements and the written professions of the heretics who were ensnared long ago in fusion and division, in order to show that the new heretics share their opinions and beliefs. It also contains a definition of the pious faith set out in twenty chapters, which confirms the doctrines of the holy fathers and councils and condemns the writings of both the past and the present heretics and likewise the heretics themselves.

INTRODUCTION

This the final session of the synod was held on 31 October. It begins with a brief speech by Pope Martin introducing the task of the synod at this session, which was principally the reading of florilegia from the church fathers proving that the orthodox tradition taught two operations and wills in Christ. Before the florilegia, however, there is first read out an extract from the Acts of Constantinople II (553) – a declaration of fidelity to the teaching of the ecumenical councils and the church fathers. Twelve fathers are named, of whom all save one (Proclus of Constantinople) are cited in the florilegia read out at this session. The same passage had been cited by Maximus the Confessor in his disputation with Pyrrhus, where its relevance for the dyothelete cause was stated explicitly: it provides support for insisting on doctrines which could be found in the fathers but had not been defined by any council.² This implies an admittance that the conciliar

¹ Taken from the Greek Acts.

² Maximus, *Disputation with Pyrrhus*, PG 91. 300D.





documents read out in the previous session were not wholly effective against monotheletism, despite the claim to the contrary argued in the final speech of that session.

There follows a series of florilegia (unnumbered in the manuscripts): I. 'On the natural operations'³ (pp. 306–14), II. 'On the natural wills' (314–16), III. 'On the natural wills of Christ our God' (316–32), IV. 'On the natural operations of Christ our God' (333–44), V. 'Passages from the heretics who assert fusion' (348–55), VI. 'Passages from the heretics who assert division' (355–7). The total number of passages cited is 165.

Similar florilegia, though with generally longer passages, were to be deployed at the later dyothelete council of Constantinople III. The monotheletes also compiled extensive florilegia, which by and large have not survived.⁴ Although there are partial fourth-century precedents (for example, in Basil the Great's *On the Holy Spirit*),⁵ the compilation of substantial collections, based on a recognition of the special authority of the 'fathers', developed only slowly.⁶ They were particularly useful at councils, which needed to claim that their doctrines represented the tradition of the Church, which only florilegia could demonstrate. Florilegia of extracts, shocking to pious ears, from the heretic(s) to be condemned also made their appearance. Both types made an appearance at the First Council of Ephesus (431).⁷ They play little part in the Acts of Chalcedon but are prominent in those of Constantinople II (553).⁸ It has been observed that the compilation and deployment of florilegia reached its climax in the monoenergist–monothelete controversy.⁹ The florilegia that make up the greater part of the acts of this final (and longest) fifth session deserve close attention.

Long-running disputes could generate a whole sequence of florilegia that copied from each other. But the monothelete dispute was (by 649) still

3 This title is modern and editorial, but the titles of the other florilegia come in the manuscripts.

4 One survives in Syriac published in part by Brock (1985).

5 Basil, *De spiritu sancto* 29. 71–4 (SC 17 bis, 500–15), which, however, cites the Fathers not as authorities on dogma but as witnesses to liturgical practice.

6 Graumann (2002) is the major study. Grillmeier (1987) 51–78 lists the florilegia of the fifth to eighth centuries. See Alexakis (1996) 1–21 for a briefer discussion.

7 Price and Gaddis (2005) I, 301–10 and 323–33 give the florilegia, orthodox and heretical, included in the acts of the session of 22 July.

8 See esp. the florilegia of 'heretical' extracts from Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret, Price (2009) I, 235–70, 358–68.

9 Ohme (2006) 286, citing Alexakis (1996).





of recent origin. We hear of a huge dyoenergist florilegium of 600 citations compiled by Sophronius of Jerusalem,¹⁰ and the compilers of the documentation for the Lateran Synod may be presumed to have drawn from it. In the earlier stages of the controversy, however, Maximus the Confessor concentrated on theological argument rather than patristic citation; the latter played only a subordinate role in his disputation with Pyrrhus, conducted at Carthage in 645. But the precedents of Ephesus I and Constantinople II required the Lateran Synod, with its ecumenical pretensions, to prove its case from florilegia. It is to be presumed that it was the Greek monks in his entourage who compiled the florilegia read out at this fifth session. That the original language was Greek is confirmed by the cases, five in number, where, in citation from a Latin father, the Latin text is a retroversion from the Greek.¹¹

The process of compilation can, in fact, be traced more precisely. The florilegia of 649 are manifestly indebted to one to be found in Maximus the Confessor, *Opusculum* 15 (PG 91. 153–84). This tract quotes twenty-seven passages, all of which reappear in the florilegia in the Acts, and largely in the same order:

Maximus (PG 91)	Author	Florilegium in Acts of 649
160CD	[Ps.-] Athanasius	III. 15
161A	Gregory Nazianzen	III. 20
161AB	Gregory of Nyssa	III. 23
161B	Gregory of Nyssa	III. 25
161B	Gregory of Nyssa	III. 22
161C	Gregory of Nyssa	III. 26
164A–D	John Chrysostom	III. 27
164D–165A	Cyril of Alexandria	III. 36
165A	Cyril of Alexandria	III. 41
165B	Severian of Gabala	III. 34
165C–168A	Ambrose	I. 2
168A	[Ps.-] Cyril of Jerusalem	IV. 27
168AB	Pope Leo	IV. 3
168BC	John Chrysostom	IV. 28

10 For Sophronius' collection of 600 dyoenergist passages see Stephen of Dora at p. 144 above. It can only have been a laborious collection of passages in which the fathers referred to Christ's human operations, which the monoenergists did not deny. Sergius of Constantinople thought that Sophronius' collection proved nothing; see his letter to Pope Honorius, ACO² II/2, p. 540, 14–19.

11 See the annotation below on I. 2, 6, 7, III. 7 and IV. 7.





168C	[Ps.-] John Chrysostom	IV. 29
168C–169A	Cyril of Alexandria	I. 32
169BC	Apollinarius	V. 4
169C	Apollinarius	V. 5
169CD	Apollinarius	V. 6
169D–172A	Polemon	V. 8
172A	Polemon	V. 9
172B	Themistius	V. 18
172C	Themistius	V. 19
173A	Theodore of Mopsuestia	VI. 1
173AB	Nestorius	VI. 3
173B	Nestorius	VI. 4
173BC	Paul the Persian	VI. 6

In twenty-one of these twenty-seven passages the quotation in Maximus is identical in extent (with the same *incipit* and the same *desinit*) to that in the Acts of 649. In five cases (III. 20, III. 26, III. 27, III. 41, I. 32) the quotation in Maximus is fuller than that in the Acts, in one case (III. 27) very substantially so.¹² How can we account for this dependence on Maximus, and for the presence of every one of his twenty-seven citations in our Acts? The most natural hypothesis is that Maximus' tract was the source used by the compilers of the florilegia in the Acts, who then added a quantity of further quotations.

The debt to Maximus of this session of the Acts extends, naturally enough, beyond the compilation of the florilegia to the deductions drawn from them. Both texts argue from the florilegia that the doctrine of two operations and two wills in Christ is the traditional doctrine of the orthodox fathers (cp. Acts p. 345 to Maximus, 169A), while the doctrine of one operation and one will was propounded by heretics (cp. Acts pp. 359–61 to Maximus, 180AB). But what precisely was to be made of the demonstration, from Florilegia V and VI, that the doctrine of one operation and one will had been held both by Apollinarians, extreme miaphysites accused of teaching a fusion of Godhead and manhood in Christ, and by Nestorians, extreme dyophysites accused of dividing Christ into two persons? A modern commentator is likely to deduce that the doctrine was common property and not a deviation. But an attempt is made in the Acts of 649 to argue that the monotheletes had managed to fall simultaneously into

¹² In the remaining case, the citation of St Ambrose at I. 2, the Latin version is no fuller than Maximus', while the Greek is taken from the fuller citation of the same passage in the letter from the bishops of Proconsularis included in the acts of Session II (p. 172, §1).





both Apollinarianism and Nestorianism. On the one hand, the Acts claim that they denied to Christ all the human emotions of distress, anxiety and aversion to death, and insisted that everything he willed and experienced was purely divine, thereby reducing his incarnation to ‘mere illusion and unreality’ (p. 371). Yet simultaneously the claim is made that the monotheletes had fallen into Nestorianism; for by asserting that conflict of wills in Christ would entail two persons they implied that harmony of will entails two persons willing the same thing (p. 362). Likewise Maximus claims that the monotheletes ‘by defining one will and operation of Christ God like them [the Apollinarians and Nestorians] both confuse and divide the account of the dispensation’ (177D). The lengthy and at times contorted argumentation in the Acts is a development from this initial claim made briefly by Maximus.

The presence of retroversion from the Greek in the case of several of the citations of Latin fathers invites further reflection. These cases of retroversion suggest that the florilegia read out at this session were originally compiled in Greek and that the Latin originals had to be hunted out subsequently. But if the Latin texts had been specially selected for use at the synod, they would have been immediately to hand. The source must have been an already existing Greek florilegium (in addition to that in Maximus *opusculum* 15, which includes only one passage from a Latin author).¹³ The obvious candidate is the lost florilegium of 600 dyoenergist extracts compiled by Sophronius of Jerusalem referred to above.

Florilegia I–II, on operations and wills

The first two florilegia (pp. 306–16) are closely connected and may be taken together. They consist of forty-four passages, taken mainly from Ambrose of Milan, Basil of Caesarea and Cyril of Alexandria. Their theme is the oneness of operation and will in the three persons of the Trinity, corresponding to the oneness of essence. Most of these passages relate to the fourth- and fifth-century debate with Arianism, and argue for the identity of essence within the Trinity on the basis of the identity of operation between the Father and the Son affirmed in the Gospels, principally the Gospel of John (e.g. 5:19, ‘Whatever he does, the Son also does likewise’).

¹³ Note, however, that four of the passages from Latin Fathers (I. 2,4–5; III. 12) were taken from the letter of the bishops of Proconsularis, and that here the Greek versions were taken from the Greek translation of that letter.





The contribution to the seventh-century debate is indirect: it lies in the metaphysical principle, presumed in these texts, that essence and operation correspond. The strongest argument for dyoenergism was that two natures or essences imply, by definition, two operations.¹⁴

Florilegium III, on the wills of Christ

The Third Florilegium (pp. 316–32), with its forty-four passages on the presence in Christ of two wills, divine and human, was the most important for the purposes of the synod. After a piece of Ps.-Hippolytus, it proceeds to twelve testimonies from the Latin fathers Ambrose, Augustine and Pope Leo (2–13). The Greek translation of these passages is exceptionally free, and adapts them to make them more effective in the dyothelete cause, as where an explicit reference to Christ's human will is inserted into a text of Augustine that simply mentions his soul (12). There follow a collection of citations from the Greek fathers, including five from Gregory of Nyssa (22–6) and nine from Cyril of Alexandria (36–44). According to the account of the disputation of Bizye between Maximus the Confessor and the monothelete bishop Theodosius in 656, Maximus produced this very florilegium (and the following one) to substantiate his arguments: 'At once, taking the book of the Acts of the holy and apostolic synod of Rome, Father Maximus pointed to the explicit assertion by the holy fathers of two wills and operations in our Saviour and God Jesus Christ; taking the book from him, the consul Theodosius read out all the citations from the holy fathers.'¹⁵ But how effective was this florilegium in the dyothelete cause?

It is striking that only two of these passages use the expression 'two wills' (15, 34), and that even these are not general statements about the properties and faculties of Christ but references to his prayer at Gethsemane, 'Father, if you wish, take this cup from me, but let not my will but yours be done' (Lk 22:42).¹⁶ The Son's reluctance to suffer, contrasting to the will of the Father, was exploited by the Arians of the fourth century as evidence that Father and Son differ in essence. This drove the champions of orthodoxy to place both these opposed volitions within Christ himself – in the divine will that he shared with the Father in virtue of their consubstantiality, and

¹⁴ See pp. 87–90 above.

¹⁵ *Disputation at Bizye* 4, in Allen and Neil (2002) 96–9. The 'consul Theodosius' was one of two imperial officials who accompanied Bishop Theodosius.

¹⁶ For the development of patristic interpretation of Gethsemane, from the fourth century until Maximus the Confessor, see pp. 90–2 and 97–99 above.





a human will that on this sole occasion opposed the divine will – even if only momentarily, since (as Luke narrates) Christ was soon comforted by an angel and accepted his destiny.

The great contribution of Maximus the Confessor to this debate was the realisation that Christ's words 'Let not my will but yours be done' express less a conflict within Christ than a supreme act of his human will, as it freely aligns itself with the divine will. Is there any hint of this in the testimonies in this florilegium? There are indeed a number of passages that refer to the subjecting of the human will to the divine will (e.g. 19 and 43), but this is far from any notion of a spontaneous submission by the human will. Maximus' interpretation of Gethsemane was not traditional, and could not be supported by patristic testimonies.

The passages cited have little to say of Christ's will outside the special context of Gethsemane and the suffering on the cross. A notable exception is a series of citations from Gregory of Nyssa (22–5) that assign a role to Christ's human will in the working of miracles. Gregory adduces Lk 5:13, where Christ heals a leper by touch while saying 'I will it: be cleansed'; this act of will is assigned by Gregory to the human will. This differs from the treatment of this verse in Cyril of Alexandria: 'It was divine so to will, but human to stretch out the hand.'¹⁷ Since it was axiomatic that the miracles were the work of the Godhead, Cyril's interpretation was (by patristic standards) more natural than Gregory's. But the two were not mutually exclusive. Only Arians and Apollinarians would have denied to Christ a human faculty of will, and the general presumption was that his human will (except at Gethsemane) simply mirrored his divine will.¹⁸ In this context a line of Gregory Nazianzen, included in this florilegium (20), was often cited: 'His will was not opposed to God but wholly deified.'

Florilegium IV, on the operations of Christ

The Fourth Florilegium (pp. 333–44) presents thirty-five passages to demonstrate the duality of operations in Christ. The first seven come from Latin fathers, translated more faithfully than in the preceding florilegium;

¹⁷ Cyril, *Commentary on Luke*, PG 72. 556B; tr. Payne Smith, p. 106.

¹⁸ Cp. Theodore of Mopsuestia's treatment of Lk 5:13 (cited below, p. 355, §1) as a case of a single volition exercised by both natures in concert. According to Sophronius of Jerusalem, the miracles were divine works, but 'effected not without the rationally ensouled flesh', ACO² II/1, p. 454, 10–11.





the rest are from a wide range of Greek fathers, given in the supposed chronological order, from the pseudepigraphal Dionysius and Justin (8–13) to bishops of the sixth century (33–5). As evidence that the formula ‘two operations’ was traditional, this florilegium is less than successful, since, if we set aside a misapplied text of Ps.-Chrysostom (29), the three texts cited that use this formula (33–5) are all of the sixth century.

It was easy, however, to show that Christ had performed human operations as well as divine ones: these ‘operations’ included birth and growth (16), hunger (22) and eating (4), weariness (17) and sleeping (4), emotions (2), injuries (3) and other signs of weakness and vulnerability. Since no one, dyoenergist or monoenergist, denied these to Christ’s manhood, it is not obvious what the controversy was about. It had also become common doctrine that, although each operation was in itself either divine or human, the two natures never operated in separation from each other.¹⁹ Together with this doctrine went the notion that it was the divine will and operation that was always the guiding principle. To cite the dyoenergist champion Sophronius of Jerusalem on the human operations, ‘He did not undergo them involuntarily or under compulsion, even if he acted with human movements ... but did so when the same [God the Word] had willed to suffer, do, and operate humanly ... and not when the physical and fleshly movements wished to be physically stirred into operation.’²⁰ Later in this same session Pope Martin was to say that Christ ‘allowed these wholly blameless emotions to be excited in him according to his will’ (p. 372). One way to express this was to ascribe to Christ a single composite operation, initiated and controlled by his Godhead, but making use of the innate faculties and impulses of his manhood. It was this that had led to the monoenergist formula of a single operation in Christ.

The reading of the first four florilegia is followed by a speech by ‘the holy synod’, in its published form manifestly a literary elaboration but probably based on a speech by Pope Martin, who could well have uttered the anathemas it contains.²¹ It sums up what the citations supposedly prove: namely, that the fathers professed two wills and two operations, ‘proclaiming this through number, terms, pronouns, identity, difference, quality, property, purport, and (in brief) every expression and proposition

¹⁹ See pp. 88–9 above.

²⁰ ACO² II/1, p. 450, 10–16.

²¹ The force in this case of the formula ‘The holy synod said’ is to give the speech a quasi-judicial character. Compare the use of this formula at Constantinople III to introduce decisions and verdicts, e.g. ACO² II/2, pp. 566, 4; 578, 12; 772, 1.





by which the true establishment and confirmation of these tenets could be wholly and completely demonstrated' (p. 345). After illustrating this systematically and in detail (and no speech of the entire synod is so obviously an elaborate literary composition), the speaker continues by praising the orthodoxy of the bishops of the synod, whom he describes as 'adding nothing and taking nothing away from what they handed down to us', while all who fail to follow the fathers are to be condemned. This principle of strict fidelity to the tradition goes back to the two councils of Ephesus (of 431 and 449), which pushed this principle so far as to treat any innovation as necessarily heretical. The speech concludes with a series of anathemas, condemning (in general terms) those who preferred heresy to the teaching of the fathers.

Florilegia V–VI, on the teaching of the heretics

The first four florilegia were intended to prove that dyoenergism and dyotheletism were the doctrines of the fathers and councils. They are now supplemented by two florilegia (pp. 348–57) intended to show that monoenergism and monotheletism, in contrast, had been held by the Christological heretics, both those who 'asserted fusion' (the Apollinarians and miaphysites) and those who 'asserted division' (the Nestorians).²² The argument that the doctrine of one operation and one will was to be found in both the main deviations from orthodoxy, despite their radical difference from each other, derived from a well-established defence of Chalcedon as the mean between two extremes. As Boethius had written of Christ in the early sixth century:²³

There comes into being in him a double nature and a double substance, because he is God-man and one person, since the same is man and God. This is the middle path between two heresies, just as the virtues also hold a middle place. For every virtue is situated in an honourable position midway between extremes.

That the miaphysites taught one operation and will in Christ was predictable, for it followed from their assertion of one nature, in consequence of the principle (equally dear to the dyoenergists) that

²² The same charge was made by Maximus the Confessor, *Disputation at Bizye*, Allen and Neil (2002) 90.

²³ Boethius, *Contra Eutychen et Nestorium* VII, 72–8, in *Theological Tractates*, p. 120.





operation and will correspond to nature. But how, one might ask, could they reconcile monotheletism with the words of Christ uttered at Gethsemane that contrast his will to that of the Father? Several of the passages cited provide an answer. Apollinarius is cited as attributing the aversion to death to the one will of ‘flesh-bearing God’ (V. 6), while several miaphysites are quoted as admitting contrariety in Christ’s will, which, although one, ‘is in part moved humanly and in part divinely’ (V. 18; cp. 19, 28, 30). At the same time, divergence to the point of conflict is denied (V. 6, 8, 9, 18). We are rather to suppose that the aversion was not a rebellious act of the will but an emotion that remained under the control of the divine will – a minimising interpretation of Gethsemane that was also common, as we have seen, among the dyotheletes and those of the earlier fathers to whom they appealed. It is manifest that neither miaphysites nor monotheletes could fairly be accused of denying to Christ those human attributes that dyotheletism, with a different terminology, was concerned to affirm.

More unexpected is the charge of monoenergism and monotheletism brought against ‘the heretics who assert division’ – that is, the Nestorians, including Nestorius’ supposed teacher, Theodore of Mopsuestia.²⁴ The writers in this tradition were accused of treating Christ’s manhood as a separate person, united to his Godhead in a merely ‘moral’ union – that is, through the free assent of the human will, exercising obedience in the same way that the saints have done. However, these theologians leapt at any expression that enabled them to assert a unity of operation in Christ that did not threaten the distinction between the two natures; they were therefore ready to talk of one authority, mastery, power, will and volition.²⁵ Admittedly, three of the most striking passages from Theodore and Nestorius cited in our Acts (VI. 1, 3–4) are unlikely to be authentic, since the works they are said to come from are unknown outside the citations here (and in the treatise by Maximus on which this florilegium is based). But wholly credible are the passages that follow and speak of ‘one power’ (VI. 5, 9) or of ‘identity of volition and intention’ (VI. 6). These passages would not have been cited if the monotheletes had simply been accused of Apollinarianism – of denying Christ a human faculty of will, which the Nestorians manifestly did not. But the charge against the monotheletes was less precise and more comprehensive – that their

²⁴ That Nestorius was a monothelete had already been asserted in the *Ekthesis* (p. 229 above).

²⁵ See Rammelt (2008) 87 and Hovorun (2008) 9–15.





assertions were compatible with each and every heresy and contrary to orthodoxy alone.²⁶

These two heretical florilegia are followed by a long analysis placed in the mouth of Pope Martin (pp. 357–61), ramming home the point that the monothelites have placed themselves outside orthodoxy by concurring with its enemies. He claims that they have even surpassed the wickedness of the heretics by claiming that the orthodox fathers were of their own opinion, while the heretics had had the honesty to acknowledge their divergence from the fathers.

Final speeches

After the presentation of the florilegia and before the synodal canons comes a series of speeches, attributed to Maximus of Aquileia, Deusdedit of Cagliari and Pope Martin (pp. 361–75), which forms the high point of theological discussion in the Acts.

Maximus begins by pressing his opponents as to whether they suppose that the single will they attribute to Christ follows from operation (as the *Ekthesis* had taught) ‘according to nature’ or ‘contrary to nature’; it is argued that both alternatives lead to impossible conclusions. This mode of argument was common property, and was to be powerfully exploited in favour of monothelitism in a text written some decades later and preserved in Syriac.²⁷ This is followed by a protest at the constant monothelite claim that the interpretation of Gethsemane in terms of two opposing wills divides Christ into two persons willing contrary things (p. 362); for if contrariety of will implies two persons at loggerheads, then harmony of will must imply two persons assenting to each other.

The argument proceeds by pillorying the statement in the *Ekthesis* that Christ’s manhood followed the ‘bidding’ of the divine will, for this could only mean either free obedience (implying a distinct human subject) or the subjection of the weaker to the stronger, which would deny the manhood its freedom and rationality. But in fact it is not the case that a will must either exercise choice between equally realisable alternatives or be determined in its operations by something outside itself. God himself neither chooses to be good nor is compelled to be good; the goodness of

²⁶ See p. 92 above.

²⁷ Published in Brock (1986).





Christ's human nature is similar in kind. Since it was 'in his paternal and ineffable intention' (that is, in his divine will) that Christ chose 'suffering voluntarily in the flesh for our sake', the human will 'is not the one willing without qualification but the one willing according to nature' – that is, the one whose will is guided not by choice but by natural impulse. It is to be noted that this argumentation derives from Maximus the Confessor, who had argued against Pyrrhus that to talk of Christ's manhood responding to the 'bidding' of the divine Word is to divide Christ and treat his manhood as a distinct human person.²⁸ Likewise, Maximus attributed to Christ a human will that does not hesitate between good and evil, exercising deliberation and choice; instead, it spontaneously follows the divine will since it is itself an uncorrupted 'natural' will, and 'nothing that is natural is set in any opposition to God'.²⁹

There follows a discussion of a celebrated passage from the Fourth Theological Oration of Gregory Nazianzen that both parties tried to exploit for their own purposes:³⁰

Let it be said seventhly that the Son came down from heaven not to do his own will but the will of him who sent him (Jn 6:38). If this had not been stated by the very one who descended, we would have said that the statement was made by man, [though] not by the one who is conceived as the Saviour, for his will was not opposed to God but wholly deified, but by man in our condition, since the human will does not wholly follow the divine will but resists and opposes it for the greater part. And this is how we have understood the text 'Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me, yet not as I will but may your will prevail' (Mt 26:39); for it is not likely that he did not know whether it was possible or not, or that he opposed will to will. But since these words (Jn 6:38) come from the one who assumed, since it is he who descended, and not from what was assumed, this is how we shall reply. These words mean not that the Son has his own will distinct from that of the Father, but that he does not, with the result that the inference is as follows: '[I came down] not to do my own will, for my own will is not separate from yours, but there is a community of mine and yours; as we have one Godhead, so too we have one will.' For many such sayings are uttered with general reference, not affirmatively but negatively.

Gregory's interpretation of Jn 6:38 ('I have come down from heaven not to do my own will but the will of him who sent me') is clear: Christ is

28 Maximus, *Disputation with Pyrrhus*, PG 91. 297A.

29 Maximus, *opusc.* 3, PG 91. 48D. See our discussion above, p. 98.

30 Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 30.12, SC 250, pp. 248–50. There are excerpts from this passage in the florilegia read out at this session: II. 2, III. 20–1.





speaking in his Godhead (for ‘the very one who descended’ cannot be the manhood) and, so far from contrasting the will of the divine Son to that of the Father, is actually denying any distinction of will between them.³¹ But his interpretation of Mt 26:39 is too compressed to be lucid. He is not denying that Christ at Gethsemane was in anguish, which he admits elsewhere,³² but he rules out any conflict of will. The reference to ‘man in our condition’ implies that he understood Christ’s distress to relate not to his own passion but to the lot of mankind in general, that is, of ordinary human beings in the face of death, whose distress Christ assumed in solidarity. Gregory’s insistence on oneness of will in Christ, together with his minimising interpretation of Gethsemane, was a godsend for the monothelete cause; Pyrrhus and Paul of Constantinople have already been cited in this session as drawing attention to it (pp. 358–9). Maximus of Aquileia attempts to wrest this passage from the monotheletes. He admits that ‘the teacher attributed the deprecation in this passage to ourselves’ (p. 367), but draws attention to Gregory’s reference to Christ’s ‘wholly deified’ will, accusing Pyrrhus and Paul of taking this to be the divine will, even though the word ‘deified’ can only relate to something that is not divine by nature.³³

The speech by Deusdedit of Cagliari that follows proceeds to the father most cited throughout the Christological controversy, Cyril of Alexandria. Most of it consists of citations from him, stressing the condescension of God the Word in taking on human limitations and emotions. To his teaching Deusdedit contrasts the monotheletes’ evacuation of the mystery of the incarnation as a result of their belief that ‘even if Christ did utter something, he was simply representing us’ (p. 371), rather than manifesting the truth of his human nature. In this context Maximus the Confessor distinguished between ‘substantial’ appropriation, where new qualities or experiences become our own, and ‘relative’ appropriation, where we adopt and cherish ‘in friendship’ (φιλικῶς) things that we ourselves do not suffer or perform.³⁴ The notion of relative appropriation, of Christ adopting an

31 Contrast Pope Leo and Athanasius as cited in this session (III. 13, 18), who take ‘my own will’ of Jn 6:38 ‘affirmatively’ as referring to Christ’s human will as differing (on occasion) from the divine will.

32 Gregory, *or.* 29.18 (SC 250, p. 214, 11), το ἀγωνιᾶν (anguish).

33 The same objection is made by Maximus, *Disputation with Pyrrhus*, PG 91. 316CD.

34 *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91. 304A). For the same distinction see John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei* 69 (III. 25) in *Schriften* II, 168, and Theodosius of Alexandria (d. 566), *Tome to Theodora*, in Van Roey and Allen (1994) 43–4, where a threefold distinction is made.





attitude of solidarity with the whole human race, was one that all commentators were obliged to adopt when explaining St Paul's startling account of Christ becoming 'sin for our sake' (2 Cor 5:21), or in interpreting psalms that the fathers had long read as uttered by Christ (since they refer to the passion) but which attribute sin to the speaker.³⁵ Maximus accused the monotheletes of using this notion in such a way as to make Christ's manhood unreal.

The speech ascribed to Pope Martin, the final one in this series, begins with a less than helpful quotation from Cyril of Alexandria, which interprets Gethsemane in terms of an excitement of the human passions (of dread and distress) that was rapidly quelled 'by the power of the Word', without any reference to the rational will of the manhood. Martin proceeds, tacitly correcting Cyril, to stress the example Christ gave of human obedience, rejecting once again the false conception (so common in the earlier fathers) that read Gethsemane as an opposition between Christ's divine and human wills and missed the real point of the story, which is that the human rational will submitted freely to the divine will – as a lesson to us to 'become temperate and lovers of mankind by rejecting temptations' (p. 375). Again, it is the teaching of Maximus the Confessor that is presented – his insistence that the real story of Gethsemane is not that of a human will recoiling from the passion but of a human will accepting it.

These speeches gain much in length, and lose something in coherence, in attempting to present their position as simple fidelity to the fathers. Their purpose was not to advance theological speculation but to prove that dyotheletism was traditional and therefore orthodox, while monotheletism was innovatory and therefore heterodox. It would have been better to settle the matter by the simple citation of patristic passages, if only the patristic inheritance had been adequate for the purpose; but, as we showed above, it talked of 'two wills' in Christ only in the context of a supposed opposition of wills at Gethsemane, an opposition which the synod, following Maximus the Confessor, was insistent in denying.

But despite this element of special pleading these speeches are still impressive in their use of the insights of Maximus to advance the understanding of Christ's manhood beyond anything that had been stated in the decrees of earlier councils. They form a worthy climax to the synodal debates.

³⁵ E.g. Ps 21:2, in the LXX and Latin versions, 'God my God, attend to me: why have you forsaken me? Far from my salvation are the words of my offences.' See Price (2011).





The synodal canons

The acts of this session close with twenty ‘chapters’ (pp. 376–83) – the canons or anathemas of the synod – after a brief introduction which links them strongly to the Chalcedonian Definition, with its teaching of two natures in Christ. The first nine chapters present a general Christology, particularly indebted to the doctrinal canons of the Fifth Ecumenical Council (Constantinople II), a council whose full authority is brought out in these chapters by the repeated phrase ‘the five holy and ecumenical councils’, in contrast to the practice, widespread in both East and West at this time, of accepting Constantinople II but not putting it quite on a par with its four predecessors.³⁶ Much the same debt to Constantinople II had been observable in the chapters in Cyrus of Alexandria’s *Plerophoria* (or *Pact of Union*) of 633. The claim implied here is that it is not the monoenergism of Cyrus but the dyoenergism and dyotheletism of the Lateran Synod that is the true expression of this tradition.

There follows a series of chapters relating directly to the debate over operations and wills. The notes we give *ad loc.* provide comment on each of them. The following points may be made here:

(a) Chapter 10, with its insistence of ‘the connaturally united wills, divine and human’, both of which will our salvation, places the emphasis immediately on the harmony of will in Christ, and refers unmistakably to an acceptance of the saving passion by both the divine and human wills. Likewise Chapter 11 describes the two operations as ‘connaturally united’, meaning that the two natures always act in communion with each other. These emphases were characteristic of the seventh century, and had themselves generated monotheletism and monoenergism.

(b) Chapters 13 and 14 condemn placing the doctrine of one operation and will in Christ on a par with the doctrine of two operations and wills, whether through an affirmation of both or a rejection of both. This is clearly directed against the *Typos*, with its ban on both sets of formulae. It was an embarrassment for the synod, convoked to condemn monotheletism, that shortly before it met this doctrine had been abandoned by Constantinople.

(c) The reappearance of the phrase ‘in accordance with the holy fathers’ in chapter after chapter is emblematic of the emphatic traditionalism of these decrees. In counterpoint to ‘the holy fathers’, the long Chapter 18

³⁶ See Ohme (2008b) 203 and Price (2009) I, 99–101.





lists at length ‘the accursed heretics’, both those of earlier ages and their seventh-century successors – the monoenergists and monotheletes. The two heretical florilegia had shown that the errors of the latter were not so much an innovation as a revival of heresies condemned at earlier councils. Recognition of the novelty of the debate over wills and operations is replaced by the myth of a timeless and changeless confrontation of truth and falsity, in which the victory of orthodoxy has constantly to be re-enacted.

It would be easy to criticise the Christological councils of the fifth to seventh centuries for their insistence on strict fidelity to tradition, their hostility to ‘innovation’ and the special pleading this led to in cases where the voice of tradition was inconsistent or obscure. Were they blind to the reality of doctrinal development? In an attempt to deceive others, did they deceive themselves? But we shall do them an injustice if we fail to appreciate that they were guided by a serious theological principle – by their faith in the timeless stability and self-identity of the truth.³⁷ A truth subject to change is not a truth but a fallible opinion. The truth has been revealed to us by God the Word, in the inspired pages of scripture. For the interpretation of the latter we have to turn to ‘the approved fathers of the catholic church and the holy five councils’, to quote a phrase often used in these Acts. The reliability of the Church’s teaching depends on the coherence and consistency of these authoritative sources. The Lateran Synod had no alternative but to appeal to them as a single voice that displays the clarity and changelessness of God-given truth.

TEXT

[247]³⁸ In the name of our Lord, God and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the ninth year of the reign of our master Constantine the most pious Augustus, on the day before the Kalends of November in the eighth indiction,³⁹ there presided Martin the holy and most blessed pope of the holy apostolic

37 This phrase is from Graumann (2011) 235. His article, entitled ‘Orthodoxy, Authority and the (Re-) Construction of the Past in Church Councils’, is a major discussion of the question touched on here.

38 This introduction and the following attendance list come only in the Latin version. The list is identical to those of the other sessions and derives from the subscription list to the synodal canons (pp. 384–7 below).

39 31 October 649.





see of the city of Rome, with the sacrosanct and venerable gospels lying displayed, in the church of our Lord, God and Saviour Jesus Christ called the Constantinian, and there were also seated to conduct the hearing equally with him the venerable men (2) Maximus the most holy bishop of Aquileia, (3) Deusdedit the most holy bishop of Cagliari, (4) Maurus bishop of Cesena and the presbyter Deusdedit, the representatives of Maurus the most holy bishop of the church of Ravenna, (5) Sergius bishop of Tempsa, (6) Reparatus bishop of Manturia, (7) Epiphanius bishop of Albanum, (8) Benedict bishop of Ajaccio, (9) Julian bishop of Horta, (10) Papinius bishop of Vibo, (11) Maximus bishop of Pisaurum, (12) Lucian bishop of Leontium, (13) Viator bishop of Ortona, (14) Bonitus bishop of Formiae, (15) Majorianus bishop of Palestrina, (16) Germanus bishop of Numana, (17) Laurence bishop of Perusium, (18) Carosus bishop of Falerii, (19) Marcianus bishop of Mevania, (20) Barbatus bishop of Sutrium, (21) Calumniosus bishop of Halaesa, (22) Peregrinus bishop of Messana, (23) Romanus bishop of Cerillae, (24) Crescentius bishop of Locri, (25) Felix bishop of Agrigentum, (26) Marcellinus bishop of Clusium, (27) Geminianus bishop of Volaterrae, (28) Marinianus bishop of Populonia, (29) Luminosus bishop of Tifernum Tiberinum, (30) Potentinus bishop of Velitrae, (31) Maurus bishop of Tuscana, (32) Martin bishop of Gabii, (33) Adeodatus bishop of Spoleum, (34) John bishop of Paestum, (35) [249] Gaudiosus bishop of Reate, (36) Laurence bishop of Tauriana, (37) John bishop of Tropeia, (38) Luminosus bishop of Salernum, (39) Sabbatius bishop of Buxentum, (40) John bishop of Tarentum, (41) Rufinus bishop of Sipontum, (42) Adeodatus bishop of Ameria, (43) Gaudiosus bishop of Capua, (44) Bonitus bishop of Ferentia, (45) Maurus bishop of Senegallica, (46) Maurosus bishop of Ancona, (47) Bonus bishop of Ficuculae, (48) Fortunatus bishop of Auximum, (49) Thomas bishop of Lunae, (50) Bonitus bishop of Ferentum Polymartium, (51) Maximus bishop of Trecalae, (52) Paschalis bishop of Blanda [Julia], (53) Luminosus bishop of the Marsi, (54) Gloriosus bishop of Camerinum, (55) Decoratus bishop of Tibur, (56) Amabilis bishop of Ostia, (57) Albinus bishop of Portus, (58) Palumbus bishop of Fundi, (59) Theodosius bishop of Croton, (60) Scholasticus bishop of Fanum, (61) Helias bishop of Lilybaeum, (62) Aquilinus bishop of Assisium, (63) Eusebius bishop of Atella, (64) Martin bishop of Centumcellae, (65) Juventinus bishop of Stabiae, (66) Maurus bishop of Senae, (67) Laetus bishop of Luca, (68) Theodore bishop of Rosellae, (69) Andrew bishop of Ydruntum, (70) Justus bishop of Tauromenium, (71) Felix bishop of Panormus, (72) Laurence bishop of





Tuder, (73) John bishop of Carinae, (74) Albinus bishop of Signia, (75) Augustine bishop of Squillacium, (76) John bishop of Regium, (77) [251] Barbatus bishop of Cumae, (78) Felix bishop of Terracina, (79) Oportunus bishop of Anagnia, (80) Firminus bishop of Blera, (81) Jovian bishop of Firmum, (82) Anastasius bishop of Narnia, (83) Theodore bishop of Tyndaris, (84) Sapientius bishop of Nomentum, (85) Maximus bishop of Misenum, (86) Gratosus bishop of Nepet, (87) Leontius bishop of Naples, (88) Paschalis bishop of Thermae [Himeriae], (89) Oportunus bishop of Pisae, (90) Donatus bishop of Mariana, (91) Bonosus bishop of Aleria, (92) Peregrinus bishop of Lipara, (93) Boethius bishop of [Forum] Cornelii, (94) Valentinus bishop of Thurii, (95) Luminosus bishop of Bononia, (96) Crescentius bishop of [Forum] Livii, (97) Stephen bishop of [Forum] Popilii, (98) Callionistus bishop of Hatria, (99) John bishop of Vicosabinae, (100) Potentius bishop of Pola, (101) Leontius bishop of Faventia, (102) Donatus bishop of Sassina, (103) John bishop of the Unnogours, (104) Stephen bishop of Dora, (105) John bishop of Gabopolis, and (106) Victorianus bishop of Uzalis.

[252] Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

The divine apostle admonishes us, 'If anyone competes, he is not crowned unless he competes according to the rules,'⁴⁰ and likewise the Lord, 'It is he who endures to the end who will be saved.'⁴¹ Therefore, now that sacred contests in defence of the catholic church lie before us and in consequence a great salvation is to hoped for from God in his generosity, 'let not our hands grow weak',⁴² beloved brethren, enervated by an attack of listlessness of any kind, but let us be strong with the grace of the Lord and in the power of his strength, who 'makes our feet like those of deer and places firmly on the heights'⁴³ the understanding of his supernatural incarnation on our behalf. Especially 'since we have such a cloud of holy witnesses encompassing us, let us cast off every weight and the besetting' innovation of our opponents 'and let us run with perseverance the race that lies before us, looking to Jesus the originator and perfecter of our faith',⁴⁴ who for the task he has set before us will bestow the Spirit of his truth according

40 2 Tim 2:5.

41 Mt 10:22.

42 Zeph 3:16.

43 Ps 17:34.

44 Heb 12:1–2.





to nature, who speaks in us and utters the greatness of the faith through the teaching of the holy fathers, whom our opponents have calumniated in writing, asserting that these men teach what they themselves have taught in their innovation. For this reason we order their sacred books to be brought, or rather the pious testimonies about Christ God that we have selected from them. For we promised to do this (with his assistance), as you know, in our session previous to this one, for the rebuttal of the heretics and the vindication of the said holy fathers.

Leontius the most devout bishop of Naples said:

If it seems good to your beatitude, before the presentation of the patristic passages let there be read to us, as is fitting, that part of the proceedings of the holy fifth council where it is synodically defined that every Christian is to accept and profess the statements and doctrines of the holy fathers, and that those who contradict them or reject any of their pious teachings stand condemned, so that our opponents may learn from this more precisely that they justly bring down the conciliar decrees upon themselves, in their denial of the patristic traditions, a denial that, contrary to reason, they have embraced in their innovation.

[254] Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

In accordance with the request of our beloved brother Leontius, let the proceedings of the holy fifth council be brought and let there be read to us, as is fitting, that part which with good reason mentioned the holy fathers of the catholic church, for a complete refutation of those who reject their pious traditions.

Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

I have brought the book of the proceedings of the holy fifth council, as you ordered, and have it to hand for your good pleasure.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Let there be taken and read with fitting honour the passage indicated, namely the decree about the holy fathers, in which it is enacted that all the pious are to accept and profess everything they piously preached.





And, taking it, Anastasius, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out from the holy fifth council.⁴⁵

This being so, we make known that we have maintained and maintain everything defined by the aforesaid holy four councils on the orthodox faith (as has already been said) and everything they decreed canonically on ecclesiastical order. For although the aforesaid holy four councils were held at different times in opposition to the heretics who had sprung up, they still maintained and proclaimed one and the same profession of the orthodox faith. Accordingly we accept everything that accords with the definitions of the afore-mentioned holy four councils on the orthodox faith; everything, however, that does not accord with the definitions of the same holy four councils or one of them and was written to defend heretics and their impiety,⁴⁶ we condemn and anathematise, judging it to be alien to piety. In addition we also follow in everything the holy fathers and teachers of the church, Athanasius, Hilary, Basil, Gregory the Theologian and Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, Augustine, Theophilus, John of Constantinople, Cyril, Leo and Proclus, and [256] we accept everything they expounded on the orthodox faith and in condemnation of heretics; we also accept the other holy and orthodox fathers who preached the orthodox faith in the holy church of God irreproachably till the end. Therefore, since this orthodox profession is maintained and proclaimed in the holy, catholic and apostolic church of God, if anyone separates himself from its communion⁴⁷ by holding contrary opinions, such a person, since he alienates himself from the orthodox faith and numbers himself with the heretics, is justly condemned and anathematised by the holy church of God.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Now that we have been shown from what has been read, namely from the decrees of the holy fifth council, that everyone stands condemned and

45 Acts of 553 III.4, in Price (2009) I, 223–4. The Latin version is not taken from the original Latin translation of the Acts of 553 but is a fresh translation from the Greek.

46 This abbreviates the original, which runs: 'everything, however, that does not accord with these definitions by the same four holy councils on the orthodox faith or was written to malign or contradict the same four councils, or one of them, and to defend heretics and their impiety'.

47 The Greek has 'faith' instead of 'communion'. The correct reading is restored in the Latin version.





excluded from the church who does not accept in word and thought the holy councils and all the holy fathers, and everything that they taught so wisely on the orthodox faith for the overthrow of every heresy, let there now be produced for our instruction the divinely radiant words of the holy fathers, that bring salvation to all who accept them.

Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

According to the orders of your holiness, I have brought the statements or passages of the holy fathers which you assembled, and produce them for your good pleasure.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Let there be taken and read with due reverence the statements of the holy fathers.

And, taking them, Exsuperius, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out:

[I. On the natural operations]⁴⁸

(1) [258] St Ambrose bishop of Milan, from *To the emperor Gratian*, Book I:⁴⁹

The blessed Paul says, 'Christ loved us and handed himself over for us,' and again of the Father, 'He did not spare his own Son but handed him over for us all.' If, therefore, he was handed over by the Father and also handed over himself, there is clearly one operation of both and one will (according to nature)⁵⁰ of the Father and of the Son.

(2) The same from that addressed to the same, Book II:⁵¹

48 In the following florilegia I translate the Greek text, whose rendering of the Latin fathers is generally a paraphrase rather than a literal translation. The more striking changes are mentioned in our annotation. The Latin version of the Acts normally restores the original wording of citations from the Latin fathers; I provide a note when, exceptionally, there is retroversion from the Greek.

49 Cp. Ambrose, *De fide ad Gratianum Augustum* I. 17, 10–14, CSEL 78, p. 47.

50 'according to nature' is not in Ambrose's original text.

51 Ambrose, *De fide* II. 8, 91–9, CSEL 78, p. 81. The Greek version given here comes from the citation of this passage in the letter of the bishops of Proconsularis read out in Session II (p. 172, §1) where I translated from the Latin. The Latin version given here is





The one, therefore, who was perfect⁵² by nature in the form of God became less in the assumption of the flesh and the passion of the man, since how could the same nature be both less and equal? Or how, if it were less, could it do the same things likewise that the Father does?⁵³ And how could the same operation stem from a different essence?⁵⁴ Surely the lesser cannot operate as the greater operates? For where there is a different essence, there cannot be one operation. Accept therefore that Christ cannot be called less in respect of the one Godhead.

(3) The same from that addressed to the same, Book II:⁵⁵

The reason why he said, 'If it is possible for this cup to pass',⁵⁶ you will learn forthwith. For we will acknowledge that the Lord had free will; or have you been led to such a height of impiety as to say that the Son of God was without free will?⁵⁷ For you are wont to diminish not only him but also the Holy Spirit in this respect.⁵⁸ But nevertheless you cannot deny the scripture that says, 'The Spirit blows where it wills.'⁵⁹ Where it wills, not where it is commanded! So if the Spirit blows where it wills, does the Son not do what he wills? And yet it is he himself who says, 'The Spirit blows where he wills.' For surely he has not placed the Spirit above himself in saying this about the Spirit, as if he were saying that the Spirit can do what he cannot do? Who of those with understanding would say this? Moreover the apostle says the same: 'For one and the same Spirit operates everything, distributing as he wishes to each his own.'⁶⁰ He said 'as he wishes', according to free will, not as he is compelled. And he distributes (as the text says) not lesser or inferior gifts but ones that

a retroversion of the shorter citation of this passage in Maximus the Confessor, *opusc.* 15, PG 91. 165C–168A, which recurs in an almost identical form in the late seventh-century *Doctrina Patrum*, ed. Diekamp, p. 75. The fuller version must have been inserted in the Greek Acts after the Latin translation had been made.

52 'Being equal' in both the original text and the Latin Acts.

53 Cp. Jn 5:19.

54 'A different power' in the original text. The change to 'a different essence' derives from Maximus' translation of the text.

55 Ambrose, *De fide* II. 6, 2–18, CSEL 78, pp. 72–3.

56 Mt 26:39.

57 Ambrose is arguing that the Son exercised the divine will and was not merely subject to it. The theme is not Christ's human will.

58 'You' in this passage are Ambrose's 'Arian' opponents.

59 Jn 3:8.

60 1 Cor 12:11.





God operates by nature, namely ‘gifts of healing’ and ‘the working of miracles’.⁶¹ Therefore how can it be that the Spirit distributes as he wishes but the Son of God does not set free whom he wills?

(4) [260] The same from the same book:⁶²

What is it that the Father wills and the Son does not will – or, conversely, what the Son wills and the Father does not will? For if the Father makes alive those he wills, say who or what kind of persons it is whom the Son made alive⁶³ but the Father does not will to make alive, when it is plain to all that the Son makes alive those whom the Father wills. For the operation of the Father and the Son is one.⁶⁴

(5) The same from the same book:⁶⁵

For if he himself is revealed as saying, ‘Everything that the Father has is mine’,⁶⁶ and one of these things is the will, it is certain and incontrovertible (because of his saying ‘everything’) that he is not excluding any of the things that the Father has, and that the Son possesses by nature the will of the Father, since where there is one and the same operation the will by nature is one. For in God the movement of the will is the accomplishment of the operation.

(6) The same from that addressed to the same, Book III.⁶⁷

If therefore the Holy Spirit is of one and the same will and operation, then he is of one essence also, since clearly the Creator is of a nature to be known from his operations.

61 1 Cor 12:9–10.

62 Ambrose, *De fide* II. 6, 29–33, CSEL 78, p. 73. Both here and in the following extract the Greek version (which I translate) is taken from the translation of the whole passage of Ambrose that comes in the Greek version of the letter from the bishops of Proconsularis to Paul of Constantinople read out in Session II (p. 173, §4 above, where I translated from the Latin).

63 Cp. Jn 5:21.

64 From ‘when it is plain’ to the end, Ambrose’s original text runs: ‘Since therefore the Son gives life to whom he wills and the operation is one ...’.

65 Ambrose, *De fide* II. 6, 43–7, 2, CSEL 78, p. 74.

66 Jn 16:15.

67 Ambrose, *De spiritu sancto* II. 12, 115–17, CSEL 79, 142. The Latin translator translates from the Greek, doubtless because, foiled by the faulty reference, he could not find the original text.





(7) The same from the same book:⁶⁸

Hence it is clear and agreed that through one and the same operation there is revealed in the three the unity of the Godhead, or rather the *tautotês* [identity], as the Greeks call it, for *tauton* means 'identical', since Father, Son and Holy Spirit are in respect of nature identical to one other.

(8) Saint Augustine bishop of Hippo Regius, from the Commentary on the Gospel according to John, Homily 22:⁶⁹

Let us do the will of the Father, the will of the Son, and the will of the Holy Spirit, for the natural kinship and consubstantiality in the Trinity reveals that its will is one, its power one, and its glory one.⁷⁰

(9) [262] Saint Basil bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, from the syllogistic book against Eunomius:⁷¹

Those who have one and the same operation have also one essence.

(10) The same from *Against Eunomius*, Book I:⁷²

How can there be difference of essence where there is acknowledged to be identity of operation? For when the essences differ, the operations also must differ.

(11) {The same from the same book:⁷³

How can the Spirit not be of the same essence as the Father and the Son, since he is of the same operation?}

(12) The same from the same book:⁷⁴

How can there be difference of essence in the Trinity, since in it there is acknowledged to be identity of operation?

68 Ambrose, *De spiritu sancto* II. 13, 108–12, CSEL 79, pp. 147–8. Again the Latin follows the Greek rather than Ambrose's original wording.

69 Augustine, *Tractatus in Iohannem* 22.15.6–8, CCL 36, p. 232.

70 The Greek expands the Latin, which runs (after 'will of the Holy Spirit') 'because this Trinity has one will, one power, and one majesty'.

71 Ps.-Basil (= Didymus of Alexandria), *Adversus Eunomium* IV (*Antirrheticus*) 1, PG 29. 676A, the original being 'Of whom there are the same operations ...'.

72 Ps.-Basil, *Adversus Eunomium* V [sic], PG 29. 717B.

73 Ps.-Basil, *Adversus Eunomium* V, PG 29. 720B. This citation is lacking in our Greek text and supplied from the Latin.

74 Ps.-Basil, *Adversus Eunomium* V, PG 29. 717B.





310 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

(13) The same from the work addressed to Saint Amphilochius on the Holy Spirit:⁷⁵

Those with equality of power certainly have equality of operation as well.

(14) The same from the Commentary on Psalm 1:⁷⁶

Those who have one nature have the same operations.

(15) Saint Gregory bishop of Nyssa, from the letter to Eustathius on the Holy Trinity:⁷⁷

If we conceive the operation of Father, Son and Holy Spirit to be one, different or divergent in no respect, it is necessary from identity of operation to deduce unity of nature.

(16) The same from the same letter:⁷⁸

Therefore the identity of operation in the case of Father, Son and Holy Spirit clearly proves the indistinguishability of nature.

(17) [264] The same from the same letter:⁷⁹

We can recognise the nature of the one operating from a consideration of the operations.

(18) The same from the same letter:⁸⁰

A community of nature is clearly shown to exist by the identity of the operations.

(19) The same from the letter to Ablabius on the Holy Trinity:⁸¹

But the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God. In this proclamation there is one God, because no difference of either nature or operation is perceived in the Godhead.

75 Basil, *De spiritu sancto* 19, SC 17 bis, p. 316, 60–1.

76 Basil, *Homilia in Ps. 1*, PG 29. 217A.

77 Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Eustathium de sancta trinitate*, in *Opera* III/1, p. 11, 12–15.

78 Ibid., p. 13, 19–21.

79 Ibid., p. 14, 11–12.

80 Ibid., pp. 14, 20–15, 1.

81 Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Ablabium quod non sint tres dei*, in *Opera* III/1, p. 55, 7–10.





(20) The same from the book on the *Our Father*:⁸²

If therefore both operation and power are one, how is it possible to conceive of a difference of nature in those in whom we find not a single difference in power and operation?

(21) Saint Cyril bishop of Alexandria, from the Commentary on the Holy Gospel according to John:⁸³

For things that have the same nature as one another will operate in the same way, while with things whose qualities have a different account the account of their operation in all respects would not be the same.

(22) The same from the same commentary:⁸⁴

For it is, I think, clear and acknowledged by everyone that the properties of the Godhead are completely inaccessible to the created nature, and its natural attributes could never occur in any other existing thing in an equal and indistinguishable mode.

(23) [266] The same from the same treatise:⁸⁵

But if it is at all possible for one of the divine properties to inhere (as they suppose) in one of those who are not of this essence and so inhere as it does in it,⁸⁶ tell me what will then prevent everything divine from subsisting also in those who are not by nature gods?⁸⁷ For if just one property so subsists without hindrance, all the rest will also have a place, and what then? We shall find everything confounded, for will not what is above move below, and what is below ascend to a place above?

82 Gregory of Nyssa, *De oratione dominica* 3 in *Opera* VII/2, p. 41, 8–10.

83 Cyril, *Commentary on John* II. 6, ed. Pusey, I, p. 318, 5–8.

84 Ibid. III. 5, ed. Pusey, I, p. 448, 15–19.

85 Ibid. III. 5, ed. Pusey, I, p. 448, 23–31. Against Arians who allow God the Word to be immutable by nature but otherwise inferior to the Father, Cyril is arguing against the notion of a partial enjoyment of the divine attributes. Christ must be wholly divine.

86 The meaning is ‘so inhere in him as it does in the divine essence’.

87 Cp. Ps 81:6 (‘I said you are gods’), understood as referring to the deification of those who are not divine by nature. This ‘deification’ does not undermine the argument advanced here, since in Cyril’s view it is strictly limited: ‘What he [the Son] is by nature and reality we who have attained these things become in a relative sense, for we have acquired this blessing by grace rather than by natural status’ (*Commentary on John* I. 9, ed. Pusey, I, p. 134, 9–11, trans. Russell (2004) 196).





312 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

(24) The same from the same treatise.⁸⁸

Let the inquisitive again reflect that the Saviour, in saying that his works bore clear witness that he was God by nature,⁸⁹ taught plainly that it would not be among things possible for the operation and power fitting to God to exist in anything indistinguishably unless it too were God by nature.

(25) The same from the *Thesaurus*.⁹⁰

Things possessing the same operation and exercising the same natural powers must of necessity have wholly the same essence as well, for none of the things that exist will possess indistinguishably the same powers and operations as what is different in nature and different in essence.

(26) The same from the same treatise.⁹¹

Things with the same operation are acknowledged to be of the same essence as well.

(27) The same from the same treatise.⁹²

If things with indistinguishably the same operation are acknowledged to be of the same essence as well, and if the Son is of the same operation as the Father, since he too 'does likewise everything that he does',⁹³ then by general agreement he will be of the same essence as well, on account of having the same operation.

(28) The same from the same treatise.⁹⁴

No sensible person would concede that things different in kind and nature possess the same operation. For fire could not have one and the same operation as water; but just as they possess a distinct definition of essence and qualities, so they will exhibit a different operation as well.

(29) [268] {The same from the same treatise.⁹⁵

⁸⁸ *Commentary on John* III.1, ed. Pusey, I, p. 373, 10–15.

⁸⁹ Cp. Jn 5:36, 10:25.

⁹⁰ Cyril, *Thesaurus* 8, PG 75. 105AB.

⁹¹ Ibid. 10, PG 105. 137AB.

⁹² Ibid., PG 105. 137B.

⁹³ Jn 5:19.

⁹⁴ Cyril, *Thesaurus* 14, PG 75. 241B.

⁹⁵ Ibid. 32, PG 75. 453C. This citation is lacking in our Greek text and supplied from the Latin.





For in those things in which operation and power are indistinguishably one, oneness of nature is necessarily secured.}

(30) The same from the same treatise.⁹⁶

For things that have the same operation are always wont to be of the same essence as well, and in their case difference of nature is wholly incredible.

(31) The same from the same treatise.⁹⁷

For if looking at the lowliness of the flesh you do not believe, he said, in me,⁹⁸ yet the sublimity of the works is worthy of note and most worthy of mention as sufficient to convince you that I am God who has come forth from God.⁹⁹ For how could one who in works is equal to the Father be inferior as regards his nature? And how could one invested with the same operation and power as he is be different from him in nature?

(32) The same from the same treatise.¹⁰⁰

For we shall not concede, surely, that God and creation have one natural operation, lest we raise the created up to the divine essence or lower what is exceptional in the divine nature to the position appropriate to things that have come into being.

(33) The same from the same treatise.¹⁰¹

For things possessing one operation will have one and the same account of their qualities.

(34) The same from the dialogues dedicated to Hermias.¹⁰²

That which is identical in operation and indistinguishably equal could not be different in respect of any of the things that exist,¹⁰³ but where things

96 Ibid., PG 75. 517D.

97 Ibid., PG 75. 557A.

98 Cp. Jn 6:36.

99 Cp. Jn 10:38.

100 Cyril, op. cit. 32, PG 75. 453BC.

101 Ibid. 34, PG 75. 605D.

102 Cyril, *Dialogues on the Trinity* 3, SC 237, p. 30, (468) 20–4.

103 The quotation is abbreviated and inexact. Cyril wrote ‘Natures whose relation to each other extends as far as a difference conceived as otherness and are parted to the point of utter foreignness could not possess identity and indistinguishable equality in an operation involving any of the things that exist.’





differ in the account of their qualities, it will certainly follow in this case that they are also dissimilar in operation.

[270] II. On the natural wills

(1) Saint Basil bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, from his work on the Holy Spirit, Chapter 8:¹⁰⁴

‘He who has seen me has seen the Father’,¹⁰⁵ not the figure nor the form (for the divine nature is free of composition) but the goodness of will, which, corresponding to the essence, is perceived to be alike and equal, or rather identical, in the Father and the Son.

(2) Saint Gregory the Theologian, from the second discourse on the Son:¹⁰⁶

... with the result that the inference is as follows: ‘[I came down] not to do my own will’,¹⁰⁷ for my own will is not separate from yours, but there is a community of mine and yours; as we have one Godhead, so too we have one will.’

(3) Saint Gregory bishop of Nyssa, from *Against Apollinarius*:¹⁰⁸

And so the wills of the Father and the Son are divided!¹⁰⁹ How then could the will be common for both? And how could the identity of nature be manifested by a difference of wills? For of absolute necessity will must correspond to nature.

(4) The same from the same work:¹¹⁰

If therefore the fruit of the will is different in the Father and the Son, it will be necessary to acknowledge also that the nature of each is different.

104 Basil, *De spiritu sancto* 8.21, SC 17 bis, p. 318, 105AB. Both this and the following citation were among the four passages (the others being IV. 3 and 29 below) inscribed (in Greek) in honour of the synod in the apse and narthex of the church of Santa Maria Antiqua in the Roman Forum.

105 Jn 14:9.

106 Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 30.12, SC 250, p. 250, 17–20. See pp. 297–8 above for context and discussion.

107 Jn 6:38.

108 Gregory of Nyssa, *Antirrheticus adversus Apollinarium*, in *Opera* III/1, p. 179, 23–7.

109 Gregory is arguing that the Apollinarian ascription to the divine Son of ‘Let not my will but yours be done’ (Lk 22:42) sets him in opposition to the Father’s will.

110 Ibid. in *Opera* III/1, pp. 179, 31–180, 2 (inexactly cited). Another argument by *reductio ad absurdum*.





(5) The same from *Against Eunomius*, Book II.¹¹¹

The community of nature testifies that Father, Son and Holy Spirit have one will, with the result that, since the Holy Spirit wishes what pleases the Son, the community of will clearly reveals the essence of oneness.¹¹²

(6) [272] Saint Amphilochius bishop of Iconium, on ‘The Son can do nothing of himself’.¹¹³

How can my works and those of the Father be distinguished, where will, reason, knowledge, wisdom, nature and Godhead are one?

(7) The same from the same work.¹¹⁴

‘Just as the Father raises the dead and gives them life’,¹¹⁵ possessing a power that corresponds to will, so I raise the dead, not fulfilling a ministry but with the same power, authority, dominion and will.

(8) Saint Cyril bishop of Alexandria, from the Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew, Book XII.¹¹⁶

But since the Holy Trinity is one and consubstantial and one Godhead is conceived in it, how could the will of Father, Son and Holy Spirit not be the same?

(9) The same from the Commentary on the Gospel according to John, Book IX.¹¹⁷

For just as he is consubstantial, so he shares a will with his begetter; for where essence is one, will must also be one.

(10) The same from *To Hermias*, Book II.¹¹⁸

We ourselves, following the reasoning of orthodoxy, say that it would be bizarre and ignorant to suppose that the Father is the begetter either

111 Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* II. 214, in *Opera* II, p. 403, 2–6.

112 The final phrase in the original (and in its citation at p. 316 below) is ‘oneness of essence’.

113 Amphilochius, *or.* 9 (CCG 3, p. 178, 107–9) on Jn 5:19.

114 Ibid., CCG 3, p. 179, 137–40. Christ is speaking.

115 Jn 5:21.

116 Cyril, *Commentary on Matthew* XII, a work surviving only in fragments. The context of the sentence cited here is provided in the Acts of Constantinople III, ACO² II/1, p. 272, 11–23.

117 Cyril, *Commentary on John* X, ed. Pusey, II, p. 493, 15–17.

118 Cyril, *Dialogues on the Trinity* 2, SC 231, p. 340, (456) 43–8.





involuntarily or voluntarily, but rather he is so by nature and essence; for he is not involuntarily what he is naturally, since he possesses, corresponding to nature, the will to be what he is.¹¹⁹

[274] III. On the natural wills of Christ our God

(1) Saint Hippolytus bishop and martyr, from the work on theology.¹²⁰

God has volition but not non-volition;¹²¹ for the latter involves change and choice. For the things that come into being correspond to the eternal will of God, and it is through being preserved by it that the things that come into being remain in being.

(2) Saint Ambrose bishop of Milan, from *To the emperor Gratian*, Book II.¹²²

But God's will and man's will are different. And so that you may learn that life is the object of man's will, Christ showed in his own case that death itself, which we fear, occurs by God's will, for it pleased him to suffer for our sake.¹²³ Accordingly, when Peter wished the Lord not to suffer and rejected his passion, the Saviour said to him, 'You think the thoughts not of God but of men.'¹²⁴ Therefore he assumed my will and assumed my distress. I boldly call it distress, since I am preaching the cross. Mine is the will that he called his own, since as man he assumed my distress, and he spoke as man, and on this account said, 'Not as I will but as you will.'¹²⁵ Mine is the distress that he assumed with my disposition.¹²⁶

119 God the Father cannot be said to have begotten the Son either involuntarily (as if it were contrary to his will) or voluntarily (as if he made an act of will prior to begetting the Son); rather, his 'will' to beget was simply part of his will to be what he is by nature, namely the Father. See Boulnois (1994) 354–7.

120 Ps.-Hippolytus, *Contra Beronem et Heliconem*, in *Doctrina patrum*, Diekamp, p. 321, 15–16.

121 Meaning a negative reaction of the will.

122 Ambrose, *De fide* II.7, 2–12, CSEL 78, p. 74. The Greek version of these citations from Ambrose is free, while the Latin version generally restores his original text.

123 The original text runs: 'And so that you may learn that life is the object of man's will, because we fear death, but that Christ's passion was the object of God's will, that he should suffer for us ...'.

124 Mt 16:23.

125 Mt 26:39.

126 Two lines further down Ambrose continues, 'Therefore he was distressed for me and in me.' He is interpreting Christ's distress not as a real feeling of his own but as a sympathetic appropriation of the distress of human beings at the prospect of death.





(3) The same from the Commentary on the Gospel according to Luke:¹²⁷

‘My soul is very sorrowful,’ he says, ‘unto death.’¹²⁸ The Lord was not sorrowful because of death, but so that by testifying to what is allotted to the disposition of the body he might reveal that he had truly become man, since dread is a genuine emotion.¹²⁹ For it was necessary that the one who had once for all assumed an ensouled body should also assume for our sake all the emotions¹³⁰ of the body apart from sin,¹³¹ in such a way that he would experience hunger and thirst, dismay and distress. For the Godhead is not of a nature to be affected by these, and it is totally without any experience of change.

(4) The same from the same work:¹³²

For he would have bestowed nothing on me, if he had not assumed my disposition. For tormented on my account was the one who on his own account did not have a mode or manner of being tormented.¹³³ While abiding without change in the delight of his own Godhead, he was affected by the anxiety arising from my weakness, since he had become man.¹³⁴ For he assumed my distress, so that he might bestow on me his own joy. He condescended to our infirmities to the point of actual distress¹³⁵ at

127 Ambrose, *Exposition of Luke* VII. 133, CCSL 14, p. 260, 1426–31.

128 Mt 26:38.

129 The original Latin (after ‘unto death’) runs: ‘The Lord is not sorrowful because of death but unto death, because he was affected by the condition of bodily feeling, not by the fear of death.’ Ambrose is arguing that Christ’s emotion was not one of distress but of impatience over the accomplishment of our redemption.

130 In the citations in this session ‘emotions’ translates πάθη, for which ‘passions’ in the most common English rendering. The word is used to refer to the negative feelings of need or affliction (neither excessive nor blameable) that Christ assumed.

131 Cp. Heb 4:15.

132 Ambrose, *Exposition of Luke* X. 56, CCSL 14, p. 362, 551–6, treating Christ’s distress at Gethsemane.

133 The Latin runs: ‘He had nothing to be distressed over on his own account.’ Ambrose is arguing that Christ took on our distress at death in order to overcome it, as an inspiration to us.

134 Contrast the Latin, ‘Surrendering the delight of eternal Godhead, he is affected by the anxiety arising from my weakness.’ The Greek is concerned to exclude any suggestion of change in Christ’s consciousness of his Godhead.

135 The Greek word is λύπη, used of feelings. But Ambrose’s word is *aerumna*, which is objective rather than subjective, referring to a misfortune not an emotion; see Lewis and Short (1879) 60.





death, entering on the experience voluntarily,¹³⁶ so that through his own sufferings he might call us back to life.

(5) [276] The same from the same work:¹³⁷

So we read that ‘he bore our lawlessness and was afflicted for our sake’.¹³⁸ For you endure, my Lord Jesus, not your but my wounds, not your infirmity but my weakness.¹³⁹ As the prophet says, ‘he is afflicted for our sake,’¹⁴⁰ yet we accounted him to be in distress, but he was handed over for our sins.¹⁴¹ Therefore you suffered torment, as a result not of weakness inhering in you from the Father but of that from us assigned to you for our sake.

(6) The same from the work on the faith:¹⁴²

Therefore he felt dread as man and was troubled as man. It was not the power that was troubled, it was not the Godhead that was troubled: he was troubled in his own soul,¹⁴³ he was troubled in the nature of human weakness; for since he took our soul, therefore he assumed the emotions of our soul as well. For he was not able to be troubled or distressed as God. But even if he says, ‘My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?’¹⁴⁴ he utters this as man, displaying my infirmities. For when we are in danger, we think that we have been abandoned by God. So he is troubled as man, he weeps as man, he is crucified as man.

(7) The same from the Commentary on the Gospel according to Luke:¹⁴⁵

136 The preceding phrase is an addition to the Latin, to bring out that Christ’s Godhead was never vulnerable, but always in control.

137 Ambrose, *Exposition of Luke* X. 57, CCSL 14, p. 362, 570–6.

138 Is 53:4.

139 Ambrose wrote, ‘You are distressed, O Lord ... not at your death but at our weakness.’ He is arguing that Christ was distressed purely out of pity for us.

140 The words ‘As the prophet ... for our sake’ are taken from a partly identical passage in Ambrose, *De fide* II. 7, 16–17, CSEL 78, p. 75. The Latin version does not include this addition.

141 Is 53:4–5.

142 Ambrose, *De fide* II. 7, 25–33, CSEL 78, pp. 75–6.

143 Cp. Jn 12:27.

144 Mt 27:46.

145 Ambrose, *Exposition of Luke* X. 60, CCSL 14, 363. Here the Latin version provides neither Ambrose’s original wording nor a literal translation from the Greek Acts. It must derive from a different Greek version.





But when he says, ‘Let not my will be done,’¹⁴⁶ he indicates the human will by this remark; in adding ‘yours’, he displays his paternal will,¹⁴⁷ since the human will is for a time, while God’s will is by nature eternal. Therefore the will of the Father and the will of the Son are not different; for where there is one Godhead, the will is certainly one.

(8) Saint Augustine, from the Commentary on Psalm 93:¹⁴⁸

Christ our God says, ‘Father, if it is possible, let the cup pass from me,’¹⁴⁹ revealing that, just as he took flesh, so too he assumed voluntarily the sorrow of the flesh. For we do not say what the heretics think:¹⁵⁰ that is, that our Lord did not become very sorrowful. For if we were to say this, what then would we say of him who affirms in the gospel, ‘My soul is very sorrowful, unto death’?¹⁵¹ For if [278] we say this, then when we hear that Jesus slept we would have to say that Jesus did not sleep, and when again Jesus ate, that Jesus did not eat, and so we would have to deny and reject each statement in scripture;¹⁵² for the worm of heretical rottenness¹⁵³ has made its way in and left them¹⁵⁴ nothing sound to profess about him, with the result that they also say of the body that, even if he assumed a true body, he yet did not have a true body. It is therefore necessary for us, having rejected this, to believe with assurance that¹⁵⁵ everything written about him was written truly, and that he became ‘very sorrowful’ – truly and exceedingly ‘very sorrowful’. For he voluntarily assumed my distress just as he voluntarily took flesh. In consequence he assumed a true will of the flesh, because he took true flesh.¹⁵⁶

146 Lk 22:42, ‘Let not my will but yours be done.’

147 That is, by ‘my will’ Christ meant his human will, while by ‘yours’ he meant the will he shared with the Father.

148 Augustine, *Enarr. in ps.* 93.19, CCSL 39, p. 1321, 64–76.

149 Mt 26:39.

150 The words ‘what the heretics think’ are a Greek addition.

151 Mt 26:38.

152 The words ‘and so we would ... in scripture’ are another addition.

153 Cp. Sir 19:3.

154 ‘Them’ (αὐτοὺς) is an addition to the Latin, which does not refer to actual heretics but simply to the heretical consequences that would follow if Christ’s distress was denied.

155 The words ‘It is therefore necessary ... that’ are also an addition.

156 The original wording of this last sentence is, ‘Just as he voluntarily assumed true flesh, so he voluntarily assumed true sorrow.’ Augustine makes no reference to a ‘will of the flesh’. The Latin Acts, which keep to Augustine’s text, omit this sentence.



(9) The same from the *City of God*, Book XIV.¹⁵⁷

It is not only because of its relationship with the body that we say that the soul desires or is glad or fears or is distressed, but we also say that of itself it is stirred by these feelings, even if variably according to the nature of the impulse of the human will; for if it becomes perverse and irrational, the movements involved will also be perverse, while if it is right and according to reason, the movements it displays will be not merely sinless but even laudable; they are clearly preceded by volition through our being moved by them voluntarily and not involuntarily. Consequently, we are wont to call them volitions, such as desire and joy. For when we achieve our desires and joys, we call them volitions, since we achieve our wishes, and when we fail to achieve them, we are moved to fear and distress as a result of our failure, but in the first case through the expectation or presence of what is according to volition, and in the latter of what is contrary to volition. For it is in hope of what we want that we desire, and in its enjoyment (assuredly) that we are glad, just as it is in the expectation of what we do not want that we fear, and in its experience that we are distressed, when as a result of events we come to perceive what is not pleasant. In all, it is therefore possible to say the things that we aim for or avoid or desire or shun are anticipated by the human will, as taking either pleasure or displeasure in them.

(10) The same from the same book.¹⁵⁸

When, therefore, these follow right reason, when we have used them appropriately, who would presume to call them maladies or blameworthy emotions, as the philosophers do? Accordingly, the Lord himself, when he deigned to live a human life in the form of a servant, [280] did not disdain in his sinlessness taking on such dispositions. For it was not possible, where there was in truth a human body and truly human reasoning or thought, for these dispositions to be counterfeit in him, especially since the gospel records these things about him plainly, as when at the hardness and 'callousness of heart' of the Jews he 'looked at them with anger and was distressed',¹⁵⁹ and 'I rejoice on your account so that you may believe',¹⁶⁰ and

157 Augustine, *City of God* XIV. 5–6, CCSL 48, pp. 420, 41–421, 15. The Greek is particularly free. Augustine argues that emotions are, in effect, volitions ('There is volition in all emotions; all of them are nothing other than volitions'), while the Greek distinguishes volition and emotion as cause and effect.

158 Ibid. XIV. 9, CCSL 48, p. 427, 61–76.

159 Cp. Mk 3:5.

160 Jn 11:15.





when he ‘wept’ when about to raise Lazarus,¹⁶¹ and when he ‘desired with desire to eat the Passover’ with his disciples,¹⁶² and when near the passion he became ‘very sorrowful’¹⁶³ in soul. For these things were not written deceitfully or according to some false illusion, but confessedly and truly, since he exhibited them all by producing them in human fashion by the power of the dispensation, when he so willed.

(11) The same from the Commentary on Psalm 100.¹⁶⁴

‘I prayed to depart and be with Christ,’ says the divine apostle.¹⁶⁵ If therefore he rejoices at the thought of departing and being with Christ, how can Christ be distressed, when the apostle prays to be with him in order to be made glad? It is therefore clear that this statement proceeded from him [Christ] as a result of our weakness.¹⁶⁶ For many are distressed when about to die, but let them preserve a right judgement, so as to entreat, if it is possible to avert it; but if it is not possible, let them say what the Lord said on our account and not on his own: ‘Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me.’¹⁶⁷ For note how you have in this saying a true preservation in him of the human will.¹⁶⁸ For the rest, mark also his right judgement and imitate it by saying, ‘Not as I will but as you will, Father.’¹⁶⁹

(12) The same from the work on the grace of the New Covenant, to Honoratus.¹⁷⁰

O men, do not give up hope, for you can become sons of God, since

161 Jn 11:35.

162 Lk 11:15.

163 Mt 26:38.

164 Augustine, *Enarr. in ps.* 100.6, CCSL 39, p. 1411, 22–32, commenting on ‘My soul is sorrowful unto death’ (Mt 26:38).

165 Phil 1:23.

166 In the Latin, ‘What was this statement but the sound of our weakness?’ Christ, acting on our behalf, gives voice to what is our distress, not his.

167 Mt 26:39.

168 The Greek adds emphasis to Augustine’s words, ‘Here you have an expression of the human will.’

169 Mt 26:39.

170 Augustine, *ep.* 140.11–12, CSEL 44, p. 163, 11–27. This Greek version is identical to that in the letter from the bishops of Proconsularis to Paul of Constantinople read out at Session II (p. 176, where I translated from the Latin). The version in the Latin Acts gives the original text in the main but with many small variations. In contrast, the version of this passage in the acts of Session II is an exact citation, apart from the insertion noted below.





the very Son of God himself ‘became flesh and dwelt among us’.¹⁷¹ Therefore make recompense to him, become spirit, and dwell in the one who became man for our sake and dwelt among us. For no longer are we without hope of participation in the Word, since, although we are human beings, we are able to become sons of God, inasmuch as the Son of God by assuming the flesh became son of man. But we, being mutable in our purpose, by changing to the better from the worse become partakers in the Word, while the Word, being immutable by nature and in no way by change to the worse, became flesh, that is, man, but not without a rational soul. For Christ our God, did not, as the heretics (namely the Apollinarians) assert, [282] become man without soul or thought or will in virtue of the scripture, ‘The Word became flesh’.¹⁷² For it is customary for scripture to name the whole from the part and sometimes the greater by the less,¹⁷³ so that it may reveal as well the humility of Christ for our sake and teach that the term ‘flesh’ should not be abhorred and shunned as something unworthy;¹⁷⁴ this is also clear from the statement ‘And every flesh will see the salvation of God’;¹⁷⁵ for it is obvious that the scriptural word is not presenting to us here flesh deprived of souls.

(13) Saint Leo pope of Rome, from the Second Tome to the emperor Leo:¹⁷⁶

As regards the form of the servant, he did not come ‘to do his own will but the will of him who sent him’.¹⁷⁷ He called ‘his own’ the one he took in time from the Virgin; ‘the will of him who sent him’ clearly signifies what he possessed timelessly in common with the Father.

171 Jn 1:14.

172 Augustine wrote, ‘For neither, as the Apollinarians supposed, was Christ the man without a soul or at least a rational soul.’ The insertion of a reference to Christ’s ‘will’ occurs also in the Latin Acts and in the citation of this passage in the letter of the bishops of Proconsularis.

173 ‘For it is customary ... by the less’ is a free rendering of Augustine’s ‘Scripture put “flesh” in place of “man”.’

174 The rest of the citation is omitted in the Latin Acts.

175 Lk 3:6 = Is 40:5.

176 Leo, *ep.* 165, ACO II. 4, p. 117, 25–6. While the first sentence is authentic, the rest is a gloss that has found its way into Leo’s text. The Latin translates from the Greek.

177 Cp. Jn 6:38. Leo’s preceding words are, ‘In accordance with the form of God he and the Father are one.’ Only as incarnate can Christ have a will discordant from the Father’s.





(14) Saint Hippolytus bishop and martyr, from the exposition on the Passover.¹⁷⁸

He was complete in all things and in every respect. While filling the universe, he stripped himself [to fight] unclad against all the powers of the air. He briefly cried out for the cup to pass, in order to show truly that he was man, but, remembering why he had been sent, he fulfilled the dispensation for which he had been sent, and cried out, ‘Father, not my will. The spirit is eager, but the flesh is weak.’¹⁷⁹

(15) Saint Athanasius bishop of Alexandria, from the work on the Trinity and the incarnation against Apollinarius.¹⁸⁰

And when he says, ‘Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass, but let not my will but yours be done. The spirit is eager, but the flesh is weak,’¹⁸¹ he here exhibits two wills,¹⁸² one human, which is of the flesh, and the other divine, which is of God. For the human will deprecates the passion because of the weakness of the flesh, while the divine will is ‘eager’.

(16) The same from the longer work on the faith against Apollinarius.¹⁸³

It happened that Lazarus fell sick and died, but the Lord’s manhood¹⁸⁴ did not die after falling sick or against its will, but went of its own accord to the dispensation of death, strengthened by God the Word, dwelling in him, who said, ‘No one takes my life from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and power [284] to take it up.’¹⁸⁵ It is therefore the Godhead of the Son that lays down and takes up the soul of the manhood he bore, for he assumed a complete manhood.

178 Ps.-Hippolytus, *In sanctum pascha*, in *Homélies Paschales* 1, SC 27, p. 179, 9–16. The editor (Pierre Nautin) dates the work to the fourth century (*ibid.*, 46–8).

179 Lk 22:42, Mt 26:41.

180 Ps.-Athanasius, *De incarnatione et contra Arianos* 21, PG 26. 1021BC. This same passage is cited prominently in the confirmation of the decrees of Constantinople III by Constantine IV, ACO² II/2, pp. 842,23–844,2.

181 Mt 26:39, 41.

182 In the context the meaning is not an assertion of two natural wills in Christ but of two contrary volitions at Gethsemane.

183 Ps.-Athanasius, *Sermo maior de fide*, SBAW 6 (1924) p. 6, §4.

184 Literally, ‘the dominical man’ (κυριακὸς ἄνθρωπος).

185 Jn 10:18.





324 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

(17) The same from the work in question and answer form against Apollinarius:¹⁸⁶

But the divine thoughts of God the Word cannot be thought of as idle and inactive, nor can those of the blessed soul that was united to him in an effable manner, since not thinking and not willing would threaten its existence.

(18) The same on 'Now is my soul troubled'.¹⁸⁷

For even though he was God, yet he fulfilled obedience in the flesh and according to the flesh and prevailed over the will of the flesh by the will of the Godhead, as he had said beforehand, 'I have come down from heaven not to do my own will, but the will of the Father who sent me,'¹⁸⁸ calling that of the flesh his own will, since the flesh had become his own.¹⁸⁹

(19) The same from the same work:

It was necessary for the will of the flesh to be moved and yet subjected to the divine will, and so human disobedience is forgiven as a result of this extraordinary obedience, that of Christ for our sake.¹⁹⁰

(20) Saint Gregory the Theologian, from his second discourse on the Son:¹⁹¹

Let it be said seventhly that the Son came down from heaven not to do his own will, but the will of him who sent him.¹⁹² If this had not been stated by the very one who descended, we would have said that the statement was made by man, [though] not by the one who is conceived as the Saviour, for his will was not opposed to God but wholly deified.¹⁹³

186 Ps.-Athanasius, *Adversus Apollinarium*.

187 Athanasius, Sermon on 'Now is my soul troubled' (Jn 12:27), preserved in full in the Acts of Constantinople III, ACO² II/2, 658–62, the two extracts given here coming at p. 660, 10–17.

188 Jn 6:38. 'Father' is an addition found in several biblical codices and versions.

189 The quotation from Jn with the words that follow comes also in the Definition of Constantinople III, ACO² II/2, p. 774, 28–30.

190 The sermon continues, a few lines down: 'The divine will scarcely allowed the fleshly will even to appear ... The flesh was in subjection, and could not divert it.' The 'obedience' was the work of the divine, not the human, will.

191 Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 30.12, SC 250, p. 248, 12.1–6, where $\mu\eta$ should be inserted in line 3, after $\omicron\upsilon\nu$. For context and discussion of this and the following citation see pp. 297–8 above.

192 Cp. Jn 6:38.

193 This last sentence is cited in the Definition of Constantinople III, ACO² II/2, p. 774, 33–4.





(21) The same from the same work:¹⁹⁴

And this is how we have understood the text, ‘Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me, yet not as I will but may your will prevail.’¹⁹⁵ For it is not likely that he did not know whether it was possible or not, or that he opposed will to will.

(22) [286] Gregory bishop of Nyssa, from *Against Eunomius*, Book II:¹⁹⁶

... how¹⁹⁷ the Lord,¹⁹⁸ ‘reconciling the world to himself’,¹⁹⁹ apportioned to the soul and the body the good works that he did for men, willing with the soul and touching with the body.

(23) The same from his sermon on Easter:²⁰⁰

The leper comes up, already crippled and disabled in body. How is his healing worked by the Lord? The soul wills, the body touches,²⁰¹ and the disease is driven out by both. For, the text says, ‘immediately the leprosy departed from him’.²⁰²

(24) The same from the same sermon:²⁰³

Therefore with the Godhead being mixed, in the manner appropriate, with each of the sections of the manhood, the marks of the transcendent nature were apparent through both. For the body by producing cures through touch indicated the Godhead within it, while the soul displayed the divine power by that divine²⁰⁴ volition. Accordingly, just as sensation

194 Gregory Nazianzen, *ibid.*, p. 250, 9–13.

195 Cp. Mt 26:39.

196 Gregory of Nyssa, *Refutatio confessionis Eunomii* 179, in *Opera* II, p. 388, 3–7.

197 Gregory’s sentence begins ‘It is possible to cite in support many statements of this doctrine from the holy gospels, how ...’. The doctrine in question is that of the activity of God the Word in relation to the body and soul of the assumed manhood.

198 In Gregory’s original text there follows the phrase ‘by means of what was human in Christ’. This is also omitted in the citation of this passage in Maximus the Confessor (PG 91. 161B) but appears in the Latin Acts, in the form ‘who as Christ is man’.

199 2 Cor 5:19.

200 Gregory of Nyssa, *De tridui spatio*, in *Opera* IX, p. 292, 13–17.

201 Cp. Lk 5:12–13, ‘[The leper] besought him, saying, “If you will [it], you can cleanse me.” And stretching out his hand, he touched him, saying, “I will [it]: be cleansed.”’

202 Mk 1:41 = Lk 5:13.

203 Gregory, *De tridui spatio*, in *Opera* IX, p. 292, 6–13.

204 All but one of the MSS used in the Jaeger edition has ‘powerful’ (δυνατῶ) rather than ‘divine’. But ‘divine’ is also the reading presumed in the discussion of this passage in Maximus’ *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91. 317A), where Pyrrhus uses it to support the





326 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

by touch is proper to the body, so movement according to choice is proper to the soul.

(25) The same from the same sermon.²⁰⁵

Again, he did not ‘will to send away fasting’²⁰⁶ those in their many thousands who were importuning him in the wilderness, but ‘broke the loaves’²⁰⁷ with his hands. Do you observe how the Godhead is revealed through both, since it accompanies each, both the body that operates and the impulse of will that occurs in the soul?

(26) The same, from the work against Apollinarius.²⁰⁸

For this puzzle in reasoning²⁰⁹ there would be one solution – the true confession of the mystery, namely that the dread at the passion pertained to the human weakness (as the Lord says, ‘The spirit is eager, but the flesh is weak’),²¹⁰ while the acceptance of the passion as a result of the dispensation pertained to the divine purpose and power. Since therefore the human will was one [thing] and the divine will another, he who had appropriated our emotions uttered, as from his manhood, what fitted the weakness of this nature, [288] and he added a second utterance,²¹¹ expressing a wish that the high and divine purpose should be confirmed (contrary to the human one) for the salvation of mankind. For by saying ‘not mine’ he indicated by word the human purpose, but by adding ‘yours’ he showed the conjunction of his own Godhead with the Father, where because of the community of essence there is no difference of will.

(27) Saint John Chrysostom, from the sermon addressed to those who left the synaxis and about consubstantiality:²¹²

monothelete position. The context is the attribution of Christ’s miraculous powers to the presence of the Godhead within his soul.

205 *Opera* IX, p. 292, 17–22.

206 Mt 15:32.

207 Mt 15:36.

208 Gregory of Nyssa, *Antirrheticus adversus Apollinarium*, in *Opera* III/1, p. 181, 12–27.

209 The puzzle is ‘Let not my will be done’ (Lk 22:42), for, as Gregory puts it a few lines above, ‘How can there be brought to fulfilment the prayer of one who says, “What I want is that what I want should not come about?”’

210 Mt 26:41.

211 The two utterances are the two parts of Lk 22:42, ‘Father, if you wish, take this cup from me, but let not my will but yours be done.’

212 John Chrysostom, *De consubstantiali*, PG 48. 766.





If therefore there is one will of the Father and the Son, why does the text say ‘Yet not as I will but as you will’?²¹³ For if this statement were about the Godhead, a contradiction would result, and many bizarre consequences would follow therefrom. But if these words are about the flesh, no criticism would result. For the flesh not wishing to die is no reason for condemnation; for this is natural, and he displayed all the characteristics of nature apart from sin,²¹⁴ and this in abundance, to stop the mouths of the heretics. So when he said, ‘If it is possible, let this cup pass from me’ and ‘Not as I will but as you will’,²¹⁵ this simply showed that he was truly encompassed by flesh that feared death; for fearing and shunning death and being in anguish pertain to it.

(28) The same from the Commentary on the Gospel according to John:²¹⁶

‘Even though I am now troubled, I do not say that I should flee, for it is necessary to bear what is to come. I do not say “Release me from this hour”, but²¹⁷ “Glorify your name”: that is, lead me now up to the cross.’ This greatly reveals what was human and the nature that did not want to die but clung to the present life, showing that he was not without human emotions. For just as hunger is not an offence and nor is sleeping, so neither is attachment to the present life. Christ had a body free of sins, but not sundered from the necessities of nature. Otherwise, it would not have been a body.

(29) Saint Theophilus bishop of Alexandria, from the sermon on the woman with a flow of blood:²¹⁸

For even if our Saviour said on the cross, ‘Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani?’, which is, ‘My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?’²¹⁹ the meaning here was not that he was far from the Father, but what the Saviour expressed was the innate desire that his body had for its life at the hour of death, so that he might show that he was joined to our likeness not in some illusion but in actual truth.

213 Mt 26:39.

214 Heb 4:15.

215 Mt 26:39.

216 John Chrysostom, *Homilies on John* 67.2, PG 59. 371. In the first few lines Christ is speaking, expanding on Jn 12:27–8.

217 Here the Acts omit ‘despite my trouble driving me to say this, I say the opposite’.

218 Theophilus of Alexandria, *Sermon on the sufferer from a flow of blood*, CPG 2620.

219 Mt 27:46.





(30) [290] The same from the same sermon:

For just as hunger and thirst and toil were not properties of the Godhead but bodily indications, so also ‘Why have you forsaken me?’ was proper to a bodily voice, since the body is of a nature never to will to be deprived of its innate life. For if even the Saviour said this, yet he made his own the weakness of the body, while continuing to be ‘the power and wisdom of God’,²²⁰ since what he formed from Mary as his own body was not of some other human being but of the Saviour himself. This is why he said, ‘The spirit is eager, but the flesh is weak.’²²¹

(31)²²² Saint Epiphanius bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, from the refutation of the Arians in the *Panarion*:²²³

And immediately he [Arius] adds that while he prayed ‘he was in anguish’, as is contained in the Gospel according to Luke. ‘He sweated’, it says, ‘and his sweat became like dollops of blood falling onto the ground, and an angel appeared, strengthening him.’ Therefore the word-hunters at once pounce on this, as having discovered a plea against their opponent, and add, ‘You see that he even needed a strong angel, for “an angel strengthened him, for he was in anguish”.’ And they are not aware that, if he had not experienced all this, including ‘Let not my will but yours [be done]’, and if he had not been in anguish, if sweat had not come from his body, then the enfleshed presence of Christ would have been a mere appearance.

(32) The same from the same account:²²⁴

Not in pretence but in truth did ‘Let not my will be done’ display the true substance of the flesh, and also to refute those who assert that he did not have a human mind.

220 1 Cor 1:24.

221 Mt 26:41.

222 This and the two following citations are omitted in the Latin version, as is also §37.

223 Epiphanius, *Panarion* 69.61.1–2, GCS 37, p. 209, 11–20. This and the following two citations, from the same page of the work, treat Lk 22:42–4. Epiphanius is countering Arian arguments that a Christ who was anguished could not be truly God, and that at the same time he lacked a human mind.

224 *Panarion* 69.61.3, GCS 37, pp. 209, 25–210, 1. The original runs, ‘All these he accepted as part of the dispensation ... making certain statements in accord with human passion not in pretence but in truth, [such as] ‘Let not my will be done’, in order to display the true substance of the flesh...’.





(33) The same from the same account:²²⁵

For mark what profit there is in this statement. Sweat does not come forth from what is bodiless, and so in speaking of him sweating it reveals real flesh and not a mere appearance. From flesh joined to Godhead on its own, without soul and mind, anguish does not result: by his being 'in anguish' it revealed that he possessed soul, body and mind together, from which anguish resulted. And again by saying 'Not my will but yours' it revealed a mind that was truly human yet sinless.

(34) [292] The blessed Severian bishop of Gabala, from his sermon on 'Father, let this cup pass from me' and on 'Save me from this hour':²²⁶

The Lord stops the mouth of the heretics in advance: in order to reveal that he put on this body subject to many emotions – this body that is in anguish at [the thought of] death, that fears the violence of death, that is distressed and troubled – he says at the end of his life, 'Now is my soul troubled',²²⁷ 'My soul is very sorrowful, unto death'²²⁸ – not the Godhead, for the divine is without passion, sorrow or dread. For, said the Lord, 'the Spirit is eager but the flesh is weak',²²⁹ with the result that he displays two wills,²³⁰ one divine and the other human.

(35) The same from the homily delivered against Jews, pagans and Apollinarians:

You saw him sharing the sufferings of the flesh that are without sin. See him also sharing in the emotions of the soul that are without sin.²³¹ The emotions of the soul that count as sin are evil thoughts, shameful reflections; these are the emotions of the soul that inclines to sin by spontaneous power. But there are other emotions of the soul that are without sin – distress, dread and fear. No one is condemned for feeling dread, no one is criticised because of fear, no one is despised because of distress, for these are universal emotions of nature and blameless and sinless emotions of the

²²⁵ *Panarion* 69.61.4–5, GCS 37, p. 210, 4–10.

²²⁶ Mt 26:39 and Jn 12:27. This passage is otherwise known only from citations in other dyothelite florilegia – Maximus the Confessor, *opusc.* 15 (PG 91. 165B) and the *Doctrina Patrum* (pp. 119–20).

²²⁷ Jn 12:27.

²²⁸ Mt 26:38.

²²⁹ Mt 26:41.

²³⁰ In the context the meaning is not an assertion of two natural wills in Christ but of two contrary volitions at Gethsemane.

²³¹ Cp. Heb 4:15.





soul. Accordingly the Lord shared in the sinless emotions of the soul. Hear him saying, 'My soul is very sorrowful, unto death,'²³² and again, 'Now is my soul troubled.'²³³ To be troubled is an operation of fear, to reveal in every way that the flesh of the manhood had a rational soul and mind and everything human apart from sin, so that he might save man completely. For no man with a heart steadfast in the faith says that Christ assumed only a part of manhood. Therefore give close attention, you who say that there was not a human mind in the flesh of the Saviour. He himself said that he underwent distress and trouble; so either allow the mind to be troubled and distressed according to nature, or exclude the mind and in place of reason introduce the Godhead and attribute the emotions to it. For what does the text say? Without the mind the soul is not distressed or afraid or troubled; these things would be impossible.

(36) Saint Cyril bishop of Alexandria, from the *Thesaurus*.²³⁴

When the Saviour is shown dreading death and saying, 'If it is possible, let this cup pass from me,'²³⁵ reflect again that, when it was in dread of death, the flesh that was borne by God the Word was taught to suffer this no longer. He said to the Father, 'Not as I will, but as you will.'²³⁶ For he did not fear death as Word and God, [294] but was eager to perform the dispensation to the end, for such was the will of the Father. He had as well a volition not to die, because the flesh of its nature deprecated death.²³⁷

(37) The same from the same treatise:²³⁸

The Saviour abolished death by his own death. For just as death would not have been abolished had he not died, so is it with each of the emotions of the flesh. For if he had not felt dread, nature would not be free of dread; if he had not felt distress, there would never have been an end to distress; if he had not been troubled and terrified, it would never have escaped from these

²³² Mt 2:38.

²³³ Jn 12:27.

²³⁴ Cyril, *Thesaurus* 24, PG 75. 397A.

²³⁵ Mt 26:39.

²³⁶ Mt 26:39.

²³⁷ The passage continues: 'Therefore, teaching the manhood to think these thoughts no longer but to seek the will of God, he says as man, "Not as I will but as you will."' The repeated mention of God the Word 'teaching' the manhood is notable but cannot be pressed. All Cyril means is that the power of the Word overcame the reluctance of the flesh, as in the following passages 37, 40 and 43.

²³⁸ Cyril, *Thesaurus* 24, PG 75. 397C. This citation is omitted in the Latin version.





things. Applying the same reasoning to each of the human experiences, you will find that the emotions of the flesh were excited in Christ not so that they might prevail as in us, but so that, once excited, they might be abolished by the power of the Word who dwelt in the flesh, with nature being changed for the better.

(38) The same from the Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew, Book XI.²³⁹

For if he had not made the suffering voluntary, even though it was extremely undesired, how then could we understand the reason for his praying and saying, ‘Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me’?²⁴⁰

(39) The same from the same book:

Mark how involuntary was the passion for the Saviour. But when it was utterly and entirely necessary to undergo it for the sake of the blessings that would result from the suffering, he made it voluntary for our sake.

(40) The same from the same work {Book XII}.²⁴¹

Therefore he deprecates the cup of the hostility to God of those who crucified him, as if by this means bringing a charge, as it were; and dread at suffering is present in him because of the manhood, but is calmed at once by the power and strength of the indwelling Word. For mark how the deprecation reveals the manhood in him, while the inflexibility of the Godhead immediately shone forth. For he said to the Father in heaven, ‘Yet not as I will but as you will.’²⁴² This he says in a human manner, since in being God he is not external to the volitions of the Father.

239 Cyril’s Commentary on Matthew is lost. Fuller versions of both this and the following citation come on p. 370 below.

240 Cp. the similar passage in Cyril, *That Christ is one*, SC 97, p. 494, 26–34 (772D): ‘When the time was immanent when he had to undergo the cross on behalf of the life of all, in order to show that his suffering was undesired, he made his address [to God] human and said in the form of a prayer, “Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me, yet not as I will but as you will.” He is saying that the one from heaven came down to make the distress not undesired, and thereby to achieve the resurrection which he alone had inaugurated for the human race.’

241 The book number is supplied from the Latin. For a fuller citation of this passage see the Acts of Constantinople III, ACO² II/1, pp. 272,11–274,8.

242 Mt 26:39.





(41) [296] The same from the Commentary on the Gospel according to John, Book IV.²⁴³

So be in no way scandalised, O man, when you hear the Saviour saying, 'I have come down from heaven not to do my own will, but the will of him who sent me.'²⁴⁴ For what we said at the beginning we shall say again: Christ made this statement on the matter for a definite and clear purpose, teaching that his dying on behalf of all was voluntary in that the divine nature had so resolved it, but involuntary in respect of the suffering on the cross and of what relates to the deprecation of death by the flesh.

(42) The same from the same book.²⁴⁵

That the suffering on the cross is perceived to have been involuntary (in a sense) for Christ the Saviour, in that he was man, is something fitting for us to observe from the very nature of the facts.

(43) The same from the same book.²⁴⁶

'If death can die without my dying' (this clearly refers to the flesh) 'let the cup depart' (he says), 'but' (since it could not happen otherwise) 'not as I will but as you will.'²⁴⁷ You perceive how powerless again is human nature even in Christ, as it is found in itself; but it is raised up to a courage proper to God by the Word united to it.

(44) The same from the same book.²⁴⁸

And that the suffering on the cross is truly perceived to have been both involuntary and voluntary for the Only-begotten has already been stated clearly, but we shall treat the matter again with more precise proofs, clarifying the truth for our readers.

243 Cyril, *Commentary on John* IV. 1, ed. Pusey, I, pp. 495, 25–496, 4.

244 Jn 6:38.

245 Cyril, *op. cit.*, ed. Pusey, I, pp. 486, 26–487, 1.

246 Ibid., ed. Pusey, I, p. 487, 13–19.

247 An expanded paraphrase of Mt 26:39.

248 Cyril, *op. cit.*, ed. Pusey, I, p. 490, 19–23.



**[298] IV. On the natural operations of Christ our God**

(1) Saint Hilary bishop of Poitiers and confessor, from the work on the faith.²⁴⁹

Therefore, having been born as man from the Virgin, and himself being about, at the fulfilment of the time,²⁵⁰ to achieve in himself the advance of man into God, the only-begotten God maintained in all the gospel sayings the following mode, that he would teach that he was to be believed to be the Son of God and would instruct that he was to be proclaimed son of man, by saying and doing as man everything that is of God, and saying and doing as God everything that is of man, in such a way that in the very speech that accorded to the nature of each of them he never said anything that did not indicate that he was both God and man.

(2) Saint Ambrose {from the work on the faith}.²⁵¹

Let therefore futile questions about words fall silent, for the kingdom of heaven, as it is written, consists not of persuasion by human words but of the demonstration of the Spirit and power.²⁵² Let us therefore preserve the distinction between the Godhead and the flesh. For one Son of God speaks in each, since each nature is in him. The same person speaks, but does not always discourse in a single way. Observe in him now the glory of God and now the emotions of man, because as God he teaches what is divine, since he is the Word, and as man he utters what is human, since he spoke in our essence.

(3) Saint Leo pope of Rome, from the Tome to the sainted Flavian bishop of Constantinople.²⁵³

For each form in communion with the other operates²⁵⁴ what is proper

249 Hilary, *De trinitate* 9.5, SC 462, p. 22. The Greek translation is virtually identical to that in Letter Collection M in the Acts of Chalcedon, ACO II. 1, pp. 20–1.

250 Cp. Mk 1:15.

251 Ambrose, *De fide* II. 9, 30–8, CSEL 78, pp. 84–5. The title is supplied from the Latin.

252 Cp. I Cor 2:4 and 4:10.

253 From Leo's Tome, in the Greek version used at Chalcedon, ACO II. 1, p. 28, 12–14. For the importance of this passage in the monoenergist controversy see pp. 240–2 above.

254 The use in the Latin version (here and elsewhere) of 'operator' rather than 'agit' (as in Leo's original text), in this the most celebrated sentence in Leo's Tome for the monothelite controversy, cannot be a mere accident, due to the influence of the Greek version (ἐνεργεῖ), but must have been intended to strengthen Leo's testimony to the doctrine of two energies or operations (*duo operationes*) in Christ.





to it, the Word performing what is the Word's, and the body accomplishing what is the body's. The first of these shone forth with miracles, while the latter succumbed to injuries.

(4) The same from the Tome addressed to the emperor Leo:²⁵⁵

Even though most certainly in the one Jesus Christ our Lord, true Son of both God and man, there exists one person²⁵⁶ of the Word and the flesh, who possesses the common actions without division or separation, it is still necessary to reflect on the qualities of the works themselves, [300] and necessary to observe with the understanding of pure faith to what the lowliness of the flesh was led and to what the sublimity of the Godhead descended, and the distinction between what the flesh did not do without the Word and what again the Word did not perform apart from the flesh. For without the power of the Word the Virgin would not have conceived or given birth, but without the truth of the flesh the infancy would not have lain wrapped in swaddling-clothes. Without the power of the Word the Magi would not have worshipped the child revealed by the guidance of a star, but without the truth of the flesh there would not have been an order for the child to be carried away to Egypt and rescued from Herod's persecution. Without the power of the Word the voice of the Father descending from heaven would not have said, 'This is my Son the beloved, with whom I am well pleased',²⁵⁷ but without the truth of the flesh John would not have testified, 'Behold the lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world.'²⁵⁸ Without the power of the Word there would not have occurred the restoration of the sick and the bringing to life of the dead, but without the truth of the flesh the one who was fasting would not have needed nourishment,²⁵⁹ nor would the one who have weary have needed sleep.²⁶⁰ And finally, without the power of the Word the Lord would not have professed that he was equal to the Father,²⁶¹ but without the truth of the flesh the same would not have said that the Father was greater than

255 Leo, Second Tome (= *ep.* 165) ACO II. 4, pp. 115,30–116,13.

256 This is typical of Leo's use of the 'one person' formula: it is constituted by the union of the natures. That the subject of predication in Christ is always (ultimately) the divine Word was held by Leo but expressed in other ways.

257 Mt 3:17.

258 Jn 1:29.

259 Mt 4:2, 11.

260 Lk 8:23.

261 Jn 5:18.





himself,²⁶² although the catholic faith accepts both and defends both, and according to the profession of Saint Peter the Apostle²⁶³ believes in one Christ the Son of the living God, both man and Word.

(5) The same from the same work:²⁶⁴

So although the Lord Jesus Christ is one, of true Godhead and manhood, and in him was absolutely one and the same person, nevertheless the exaltation by which (as the teacher of the Gentiles says) ‘God exalted him and bestowed on him the name that is above every name’²⁶⁵ is something we attribute to the form that was going to be enriched by the increase of such glory. For it is clear that, ‘being in the form of God’, the Son was ‘equal’²⁶⁶ to the Father and that between the Father and the Only-begotten there was no separation in essence and no difference in Godhead, and that it is not the case that the mystery of the incarnation took away from the Word something that had to be restored to him by the grace of the Father. But ‘the form of the servant’²⁶⁷ through which the impassible Godhead accomplished the mystery of piety, is the human lowliness that advanced to the glory of divine power, while in the conception by the Virgin Godhead and manhood were bonded in such unity that neither separately from his being man was there performed what is divine nor separately from his being God was there performed what is human.²⁶⁸

(6) [302] The same from the same work:²⁶⁹

For in accordance with the power of the Godhead whatever the Father has the Son possesses indistinguishably,²⁷⁰ and whatever in the form of a servant he received from the Father he, being in the form of God,²⁷¹ himself bestowed. For according to the form of God he and the Father are one,²⁷² but according to the form of the servant he came not to do his own will,

262 Jn 14:28.

263 Mt 16:16.

264 Second Tome, ACO II. 4, p. 117, 8–18.

265 Phil 2:9.

266 Phil 2:6.

267 Phil 2:7.

268 Contrast the pithier Latin: ‘that neither are the divine things performed without the manhood nor the human without the Godhead’.

269 Second Tome, ACO II. 4, p. 117, 23–9.

270 Jn 16:15.

271 Phil 2:6–7.

272 Jn 10:30.





but that of the one who sent him.²⁷³ According to the form of God, as the Father has life in himself, so he granted the Son to have life in himself,²⁷⁴ but according to the form of the servant his soul was very sorrowful, unto death.²⁷⁵

(7) The same from the same work:²⁷⁶

Even though most certainly, right from the beginning when the Word became flesh in the womb of the Virgin – that is, took flesh – there was no division of any kind between each form, and in the course of all the bodily growth the actions at whatever time belonged to one person, nevertheless we do not merge in any mixture at all everything performed, without separation, but from the character of the works we deduce the form to which they belonged.

(8) Saint Dionysius the Areopagite, bishop of Athens, from the book on the Divine Names, Chapter 2:²⁷⁷

As regards the benevolent divine activity in our regard, a case of differentiation is that of the supra-essential Word's wholly and truly receiving our essence from us and doing and suffering whatever in the divine work of his humanity was approved and chosen. For in this the Father and the Spirit in no respect took part, unless one were to assert this as regards the benevolent and philanthropic will and the whole of the transcendent and ineffable divine work that was performed by the one who became like us, while remaining immutable as God and the Word of God.

(9) The same from Letter 4, to Gaius:²⁷⁸

No less full of supra-essentiality is the one who is always supra-essential. Most certainly, in the very abundance of this, he truly entered into essence as well, and performed the operations of a man while transcending both essential essence and manhood. This is shown by a virgin conceiving him

273 Jn 6:38.

274 Jn 5:26.

275 Mt 26:38.

276 Second Tome, ACO II. 4, p. 116, 13–17. While in the preceding extracts from this work the Latin Acts give Leo's original text, here it gives a retroversion from the Greek. The fact that this passage is wrongly placed (it should have come before §6) may explain the failure of the editors to find it in Leo's text.

277 Ps.-Dionysius, *On the Divine Names* 2.6, in *Corpus Dionysiacum* I, p. 130, 5–11.

278 Ps.-Dionysius, *ep.* 4, in *Corpus Dionysiacum* II, pp. 160, 5–161, 2.





supernaturally, and by unstable water supporting the weight of material and earthly feet without yielding, but instead becoming firm through supernatural power.²⁷⁹

(10) [304] Justin the Philosopher, bishop and martyr, from *On the Trinity*, Book III, Chapter 17.²⁸⁰

Just as man is one but has two different natures, and plans with one and performs what he has planned with the other (planning the construction, perhaps, of a ship with his rational soul, while bringing his plan to realisation with his hands), so the Son, being one [person] and yet two natures, worked the divine signs with one nature and accepted what was lowly with the other.

(11) The same from the same chapter.²⁸¹

Just as no one could separate the operation of light, with which light is one, from the body capable of receiving it, but by a mental discrimination would determine the nature to which the operation was proper, so in the case of the one Son of God no one would separate every operation from the one Sonship, but would determine mentally the nature to which the occurrence belonged.²⁸²

(12) The same from the same chapter.²⁸³

Christ was not perfected as Christ out of Godhead and manhood, being distinct from the two, but he is both God and man, being recognised as God from the operation of the prodigies and proved to be man by the likeness of his natural sufferings.

(13) The same from the same chapter.²⁸⁴

For the Lord is truly both God and man, and he performed the miracles according to the greater nature, while he underwent by nature what was lowly according to the lesser one.

279 Cp. Mt 14:25.

280 Ps.-Justin (= Theodoret of Cyrrhus), *Expositio rectae fidei* 11, PG 6. 1225BC.

281 Ibid. 12, PG 6. 1232A.

282 Compare Cyril of Alexandria's talk of the duality in Christ being 'in contemplation alone'. That even Theodoret could use similar language confirms that Cyril's phrase does not deny the continuing distinction between the natures. See de Halleux (1993).

283 Ibid. 11, PG 6. 1228B.

284 Not a genuine quotation but a paraphrase of §10 above.





(14) Saint Athanasius bishop of Alexandria, from *Against the Arians*, Book III.²⁸⁵

{These points we have of necessity examined first, so that, if we see him doing or saying anything divinely through the instrumentality of his own body, we may know that he performs these things as God, and again, if we see him speaking or suffering humanly, we may not be ignorant that, bearing flesh, he became man and does and speaks these things accordingly. For recognising what is distinctive of each, and observing and comprehending the performance of both by one [person], we believe correctly and will never be led astray.}²⁸⁶

(15) [306] {The same from the same work:}²⁸⁷

For later, and for our sake, he became man and, as the apostle says, ‘the Godhead dwelt bodily²⁸⁸ in the flesh, which is equivalent to saying that, while being God, he had his own body, and in his use of this instrument was man. Accordingly, there are attributed to him on the one hand the properties of the flesh, since of the flesh are such things as hunger, thirst, suffering, weariness and the like, of which the flesh is capable, and on the other the properties of the Word itself, such as raising the dead, making the blind see, and curing the woman with an issue of blood, which he performed through his body.

(16) The same from the dogmatic letter to the Antiochenes.²⁸⁹

Therefore the Word is defined theologically, while the man has a genealogy,²⁹⁰ so that the same [person] may be related to each according to nature and truth, [being] God in respect of the eternity of the Godhead and the work of creation, and man in respect of birth from a woman and growing in age – God in the operations that give life, and man in the fellow-suffering similar in character [to ours], and in the infirmities like ours.

285 Athanasius, *Contra Arianos* III. 35, PG 26. 397BC.

286 The following quotation, and the new heading for §15, are lacking in our Greek text and supplied from the Latin.

287 Ibid. III. 31, PG 26. 389AB.

288 Col 2:9.

289 Ps.-Athanasius, *On the incarnation against Apollinarius* II. 18, PG 26. 1164BC.

290 This contrasts Jn 1, with its theology of the divine Word, to Mt 1, with its genealogy tracing Christ’s descent from Abraham.





(17) The same, from his treatise on the saying in the Gospel according to Matthew, ‘Whoever says a word against the son of man ...’.²⁹¹

For on this account, being God and becoming man, as God he raised the dead, cured all by a word and turned water into wine (for these works were not the man’s), while, as bearing a body, he was thirsty and weary and suffered, for these were not properties of the Godhead.

(18) The same from the same work:²⁹²

These things did not take place in separation according to the character of the occurrences, in such a way that those of the body were displayed without the Godhead and those of the Godhead without the body, but everything took place in conjunction, and the Lord who performed these things was one.

(19) [308] The same from the same work:²⁹³

So heretics have raved in their ignorance: some, noting the bodily characteristics of the Saviour, have rejected ‘In the beginning was the Word’,²⁹⁴ while others, observing those of the Godhead, have not recognised ‘The Word became flesh’.²⁹⁵ But as for the man who is faithful and apostolic and acknowledges God’s love for mankind, when he notes the signs of the Godhead he marvels at the Lord in the body, and when again he observes the properties of the body he is astounded to recognise in them the operation of the Godhead.²⁹⁶

(20) Saint Basil bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, from the letter to Saint Amphilochius:²⁹⁷

Yet for one who examines with correct perception, many of the sayings are uttered by the human part, for ‘Give me to drink’²⁹⁸ is an utterance expressive of bodily need.

291 Athanasius, *On Qui dixerit verbum in filium* (PG 26. 656C) on Mt 12:32.

292 Ibid., PG 26. 657A.

293 Ibid., PG 26. 657B.

294 Jn 1:1.

295 Jn 1:14.

296 Note the emphasis on the divine operations performed in the body. This passage is closer to Apollinarianism (where the Godhead is the source of the body’s vitality) than to dyoenergism.

297 Basil, *ep. 236.1, Lettres*, ed. Courtonne, III, p. 49, 48–51.

298 Jn 4:7.





(21) Saint Gregory bishop of Nyssa {from *Against Eunomius*, Book IV}:²⁹⁹

For just as it is impossible for the properties of the flesh to be perceived in the Word who was in the beginning, so again it is impossible to apprehend the properties of the Godhead in the nature of the flesh. Since therefore the teaching about our Lord is one of a mixture³⁰⁰ of both exalted and divine things and also humble and human ones, we assign each of the terms correspondingly to each of the [realities] perceived in the mystery, the human to the manhood and the exalted to the Godhead.

(22) The same on ‘Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness’.³⁰¹

For having remained for forty days without food, ‘afterwards he began to be hungry’.³⁰² For when he wished it, he granted the nature the opportunity to perform its own operation.³⁰³

(23) The same from *Against Eunomius*, Book III, Tome 10:³⁰⁴

For if they look for all these things even in the Godhead – the tangible, the visible, the digestion of food and drink, that which is akin and cognate to mankind, and whatever is perceived in bodily nature – let them assert them even of the only-begotten God, and let them ascribe to him these and whatever they like, including the operation of travel and local movement, something that is proper to those circumscribed in a body.

(24) [310] Saint Amphilochius bishop of Iconium, on ‘The Father is greater than I’.³⁰⁵

For the matter was not involuntary, but the passion was self-chosen:

299 Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* III.4.7–8, in *Opera* II, p. 136, 10–18. The title is supplied from the Latin.

300 Cp. Gregory, *Antirrheticus*, in *Opera* III/1, p. 151, 17–19: the Word ‘was mingled with the man and received the whole of our nature in himself, so that through mingling with the divine the human might be deified together with it.’ From the fifth century the language of ‘mixture’ was avoided as suggesting Apollinarianism, but Gregory needed it to balance his insistence (as in §23 below) on the distinction between the two natures.

301 Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Beatitudes* 4, in *Opera* VII/2, p. 114, 6–8.

302 Mt 4:2.

303 Mt 4:2 (to which cp. Lk 4:2, ‘When the days were completed, he began to be hungry’). Cp. Athanasius, Sermon ‘Now is my soul troubled’ in the Acts of Constantinople III (ACO² II/2, 660): ‘He abstained from bodily food for forty whole days and the body was not hungry: it was after this, as scripture says, that he became hungry.’

304 Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* III.10.3, in *Opera* II, pp. 289, 22–290, 5.

305 Amphilochius of Iconium (c.340–c.400), *fr.* II, CCG 3, p. 229, 31–5. The Greek text





‘I depart and I come to you’.³⁰⁶ I depart and I come: both these changes of place I make as man, but as God I am with you inseparably. As man I depart through death, and as man I come again through the resurrection.

(25) Saint Epiphanius bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, from the Refutation of Marcion, Chapter 77:³⁰⁷

How did the breaking of the bread take place,³⁰⁸ Marcion? In illusion or in reality, through the operation of a body with weight? For when he rose from the dead, it was in truth that he rose in the holy body itself; therefore it was also in truth that he broke the bread.

(26) Saint Cyril bishop of Jerusalem, from the homily delivered on the gospel where the Lord turned water into wine:³⁰⁹

He consistently took pains neither to reveal his own Godhead nor completely to hide it. On account of those who were then he took pains not to reveal it, and on account of those who would come afterwards he took pains not to hide it, but to make evident the operations of both his Godhead and his manhood, so that there should be no obscuring of the divine power and no lack of belief in the human nature.

(27) The same from the same sermon:

He was born, he worked miracles, he displayed a double operation, suffering as man, and the same operating as God. For he was not two distinct persons, even if he operated in two distinct ways.³¹⁰

(28) {Saint John bishop of Constantinople, from the sermon}³¹¹ on the widow who contributed two copper coins into the treasury,³¹² which begins, ‘Simple is the term “fasting”’:

of 649 is incomplete and unsatisfactory, and I translate from the Latin, which is an accurate rendering of the Greek known from other sources.

306 Jn 14:28.

307 Epiphanius, *Panarion* 42.11.15, GCS 31, p. 154, 15–18. This treats Marcion as a Docetist who denied the reality of Christ’s body.

308 Cp. Lk 24:35 (at Emmaus).

309 Ps.-Cyril of Jerusalem, *Sermon on the water turned into wine*. Known only from dyoenergist florilegia. For a fuller citation of this passage see PG 33. 1181A.

310 Literally, ‘[he was] not one and another, even if [he operated] in one way and another way.’

311 Supplied from the Latin.

312 John Chrysostom, *Sermo de vidua*, on Mk 12:41–4.





And as regards the other [features] of the conjoined natures, the operation of the manhood and the power of the Godhead are different. If I may give examples, below he is weary and above he conjoins the elements, below he is hungry and from above he distributes rain, below he is afraid and above he thunders,³¹³ [312] below he appears in a law-court and from above he sees himself. In the matter of almsgiving the dual operation comes together: for the one who from above (from the Cherubim) rewards the merciful is the one, seated before the treasury, who approves the compassionate.³¹⁴

(29) The same from the sermon on Thomas the Apostle:³¹⁵

Hearing this, I cleansed my soul from disbelief, shed a doubtful mind and recovered conviction. I touched the body, rejoicing and trembling, I opened with my fingers also the eye of the soul, and was then aware of two operations.³¹⁶

(30) Saint Cyril bishop of Alexandria, from the Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews.³¹⁷

If he perfected us through water and the Spirit,³¹⁸ surely the same operated both divinely and humanly at the same time, being, in a single being, both God and man together.

(31) {The same from the *Thesaurus*, Chapter 22}.³¹⁹

The Word of God became man not in order to perform and utter everything again as God before the incarnation, but so that often through the neediness of the dispensation with the flesh he might say certain things as man.³²⁰ Therefore, since the mystery had this power, would it not be

313 Jn 12:27–9.

314 Ezek 1:26, Mk 12:41–4.

315 Ps.-Chrysostom, *In S. Thomam apostolum*, PG 59. 500. Also cited at Constantinople III (ACO² II/1, p. 340, 11–16). This passage was one of four inscribed in Santa Maria Antiqua in Rome in celebration of this synod (see p. 314 above, n. 104).

316 It is clear from the context that this refers not to two operations in Christ, but to two operations (of the bodily senses and the ‘eyes’ of the soul) by which St Thomas perceived the risen Christ.

317 A fragment from a lost part of Cyril’s *Commentary on Hebrews*.

318 Cp. Jn 3:5.

319 Cyril, *Thesaurus* 24 (*sic*), PG 75. 400AB. The heading is supplied from the Latin.

320 As an example Cyril cites (immediately after this passage) Jn 12:27, ‘Now is my soul troubled.’





absurd for the hearers to take offence at his speaking, at times, in a more human way? For he speaks as man, and also speaks as God, having power to do both.

(32) The same from the *Thesaurus*:³²¹

Therefore what was said and done divinely shows that Christ the Saviour was God. And again what was said and happened³²² humanly shows that he was truly man, for this is the power of the mystery.

(33) {Saint Ephraem bishop of Antioch, from *Against Severus*, Chapter 56}:³²³

Now acknowledging that God the Word incarnate performed this operation,³²⁴ we affirm that in part it occurred (appropriately) in respect of the nature of the flesh, and in part because of the transcendent nature of the Godhead, in such a way that here were two operations.

(34) [314] {Saint John bishop of Scythopolis, from *Against Severus the heretic*, Book VIII, Chapter 3}:³²⁵

You observe that we observe that the operations of one and the same Jesus Christ our Lord were two, of both his Godhead and his manhood, without either separation or change.³²⁶

(35) {Saint Anastasius bishop of Antioch, from the *Defence of the Tome of Pope Leo*}:³²⁷

321 *Thesaurus* 24, PG 75. 393D.

322 The distinction between what was 'done' by Christ as divine and what 'happened' (γεγονότα) to him as human is significant: the human element in Christ's operation is conceived by Cyril in terms of limitation and passivity, while actions are attributed to the Godhead.

323 Ephraem of Antioch, *Contra Severum*. The title is supplied from the Latin. For a fuller citation of this passage see the Acts of Constantinople III, ACO² II/1, 356–8.

324 The reference is to Christ's walking on water, which Ephraem has just described as the work of 'the Godhead operating through human flesh'.

325 John of Scythopolis, *Contra Severum* VIII.3. The title is supplied from the Latin. For a fuller citation of this passage see the Acts of Constantinople III, ACO² II/1, 366–8.

326 The operation of the manhood that John mentions in this context is Christ in heaven remembering the events of his earthly life.

327 The heading is supplied from the Latin. For a fuller citation of this passage see the Acts of Constantinople III, ACO² II/1, 362–4. In his dispute with the 'tritheist' John Philoponus, however, Anastasius came to assert one operation in Christ. See Di Berardino (2006) 214–16 and Uthemann (1997) 394–403.





344 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

For just as nurture and growth do not pertain to the Godhead, so raising the dead does not pertain to the manhood. Yet both pertain to the same [person] who appropriately mixed Godhead with manhood, not in fusion but in a union without fusion. Therefore the operations are two, just as the essences are, while he who operates is one, the same both God and man.

The holy synod said:

When eagerly completing their account of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, the holy fathers did not hide the lamp of knowledge by grace, given by him, under a bushel of profitless obscurity, but placed it on the lamp-stand of teaching profitable to the soul, so that it might shine for all in the house,³²⁸ namely the congregations of the catholic church, lest anyone from among those who piously acknowledge the Lord should stub his foot against the stone³²⁹ of heretical deceit. For 'you,' said the Lord, 'are the light of the world and the salt of the earth,'³³⁰ on account of their [the fathers] purging the whole error of the heretics and searing the corruption of the emotions of earthly thought through the virtue and truth they displayed. For this reason he added, 'Let your light shine before men so that they see your good works' and in addition your doctrines, 'and give glory to your father in heaven'.³³¹ This we too have come to understand through the reading of their pious words, and have given glory to 'the Father of lights, from whom every good gift and every perfect endowment'³³² was sent down to them for the equipping of his catholic and apostolic church. Their accusers we have justly denounced for contriving to obscure by their innovation the authentic truth of so great a light. Therefore, as the blessed Isaiah says, 'The impious have no cause for rejoicing, said the Lord God: cry out mightily and spare not, raise your voice like a trumpet, and announce to my people'³³³ the abominations that our opponents have committed against the holy fathers and councils of the catholic church. For it is necessary [316] that our voice go out on this matter to the whole earth and the power of our words to the ends of the world,³³⁴ while for the assurance of the orthodox congregations these declare to all that both orally and in writing

328 Cp. Mt 5:15.

329 Cp. Mt 4:6.

330 Mt 5:14, 13.

331 Mt 5:16.

332 Jas 1:17.

333 Is 57:21–58:1.

334 Cp. Ps 18:5.





Cyrus and Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul have slandered the holy fathers, as also the holy five councils, and stand convicted of lying in their rashness, since never in any mode or utterance have they spoken or thought what the pious fathers spoke and thought. To this bear witness their [the fathers'] words, which outshine every beam of the sun and publish to all everywhere the truth of their teaching, and which we have just read. For they 'delivered' to us what they had first 'received',³³⁵ that we are to acknowledge one and the same our Lord and God Jesus Christ, existing from two and in two natures, hypostatically united without fusion or separation, and that, as the one and the same has two natures, so also has he in truth two natural wills, divine and human, and two essential operations, divine and human; nor [did they say] these things incidentally or carelessly, without full and proper seriousness in their account of this very matter, as our opponents blather.

Because of their heretical beliefs they slander the holy fathers in the following way as well, by claiming that they expounded no definitions about the wills and operations of our Saviour. For mark how – not only by way of definition, but also dogmatically, scripturally, syllogistically, naturally, demonstratively, controversially, paradigmatically, and (in brief) in every mode and expression of their knowledgeable and enlightened teaching – they lawfully and courageously wrestled against their opponents in defence of God the Word incarnate and made war on the heretics Arius, Apollinarius, Nestorius and in brief all the impious of their persuasion. They professed, and handed down to be professed, the wills and operations of the one and the same Christ God, proclaiming this through number, terms, pronouns, identity, difference, quality, property, purport, and (in brief) every expression and proposition by which the true establishment and confirmation of these tenets could be wholly and completely demonstrated: through number by their saying that in the one and the same Christ are two wills, two operations and a double operation, through terms by affirming divine will and human will, divine operation and human operation, through pronouns by affirming that 'the human will was *one* and the divine will *another*',³³⁶ and the operations likewise, through difference by saying 'No sensible person would concede that things different in kind and nature possess the same operation',³³⁷ through identity by stating 'For things with

335 1 Cor 11:23.

336 Cited above on p. 326, §26.

337 Cited on p. 312, §28.





the same operation are acknowledged to be of the same essence as well³³⁸ and 'Community of will reveals oneness of essence',³³⁹ through qualities by saying that as the account of their essence and quality differs, so too does their operation, through properties by declaring 'But if it is at all possible for one of the divine properties to inhere in one of those who are not of it [the Godhead] in essence and so [318] inhere [in him] as it [the Godhead] does itself, tell me, what will then prevent everything divine from subsisting [in those not divine]? And what then? We shall find everything confounded, for what is above will move below, and what is below will ascend above',³⁴⁰ and through purport by exclaiming 'Things possessing the same operation and exercising the same natural powers must of necessity have wholly the same essence, and none of the things that exist will possess indistinguishably the same powers and operations as what is different in nature and different in essence'.³⁴¹

And so the God of the saints and our Lord Jesus Christ, by uttering these things about himself 'at many times and in many ways'³⁴² through his holy fathers, enlightened us with the orthodox faith in himself, so that we would hold it inviolably in accordance with the utterances of the fathers, and [taught us] that the said men together with their impious writings are alien and extraneous to it, since they have denied it in writing. Therefore, all of us in accord, with one heart and voice, while condemning these men and their doctrines according to the decrees and ordinances of the holy councils that bid us do this in every way, have approved the doctrines and statements of our holy fathers, adding nothing and taking nothing away from what they handed down to us.

We believe as the fathers believed, we preach as they preached, we teach as they taught, we confirm inviolably the holy and ecumenical five councils, we preserve their decrees, we maintain their decisions in their totality, and our definitions accord with what they laid down in their own pronouncements.

Whoever does not accept them and all the holy fathers stands condemned. Whoever does not accept and acknowledge all their declarations and definitions stands condemned. Whoever approves any of the abominable utterances of the heretics stands condemned.

338 Cited on p. 312, §27.

339 Cited on p. 315, §5.

340 Cited, more accurately, on p. 311, §23.

341 Cited on p. 312, §25.

342 Heb 1:1.





Now that we have in this way piously determined these things, it is appropriate that, just as we have proved by reference to the holy fathers that the teaching of our opponents contradicts theirs, so we should demonstrate by reference to the heretics [of the past] that the teaching of the said men accords with theirs. For it is written, ‘Behold, I am against you, says the Lord God Almighty, and I shall uncover your hind parts before your face and reveal to the nations your disgrace and to the kingdoms your dishonour, and I shall cast abomination upon you according to your uncleannesses and make an example of you, and it shall be that everyone who sees you will desert you and say, “Wretched is the heresy of the heretics: who will lament over it?”’³⁴³

It is therefore incumbent yet again to uncover the shame of the said men before their face, so that we may make known to all which heretics it is whose uncleanness they carry round in themselves as a result of their innovation, while falsely asserting for the deception of the simply-minded that they are in agreement with the holy fathers and the ecumenical holy five councils.

[320] So let there be produced before us the books of the falsely believing heretics, or rather passages excerpted from them by those who are assisting the proceedings, in order to make their heresy an object of derision.

Theophylact, *primicerius* of the notaries of the apostolic see, said:

In accordance with the sacred instructions of your beatitude, I have brought and have [to hand] the passages excerpted by us from the books of the heretics, for your good pleasure.

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God’s holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Let the passages of the heretics that have been brought be taken and read, to prove the agreement and accord with them of those who have introduced innovations concerning the faith.

And, taking them, Theodore, regional notary of the apostolic see, read out, translated from Greek into Latin:

343 Nah 3:5–7, ‘the heresy of the heretics’ being an addition.





V. Passages from the heretics who assert fusion³⁴⁴

(1) Lucius, who was the Arian bishop of Alexandria,³⁴⁵ from his sermon on Easter:

How, then, was there need of a soul, with the result that a complete man would be worshipped together with God? This is why John truthfully proclaims, ‘The Word became flesh,’ as equivalent to saying that he was conjoined with flesh but not, however, with a soul as well, as is asserted by those now trafficking with the faith, but was united to the body and became one with it. But how is Christ one, unless he is one person and one composite nature, just as we recognise in the case of the composition of a human being from soul and body? For if he had a soul, as in the bastard creed now preached by bastards to the churches, the movements of God and of the soul would be in contention, for each of these is self-moving and impelled to different operations.³⁴⁶

(2) The heretic Apollinarius, from *Against Diodore*:³⁴⁷

The instrument and that which moves it are of a nature to accomplish a single operation. Things with one operation have also one essence. Therefore there was one essence of the Word and the flesh.³⁴⁸

[322] (3) The same, from the treatise written by him against those who contend against the divine incarnation of the Word on the ground of the *homoousion*:³⁴⁹

And the Jews who crucified the body crucified God, and no separation of the Word and the flesh is to be found in the divine scriptures; but he is one nature, one hypostasis and one operation.

344 That is, the heretics (Arian, Apollinarian or Monophysite) who fuse or merge the two natures of Christ.

345 Lucius was the Arian (more properly, Homoean) bishop of Alexandria 361–78.

346 Denial to Christ of a human rational soul occurred prior to Apollinarianism. It was attributed to Arius by his ancient critics and is attributed to Athanasius by his modern critics. See Young (2010) 63–4.

347 Lietzmann (1904) pp. 235, 26–236, 2. For Apollinarius’ Christology see Young (2010) 245–53.

348 The fuller citation of this passage at Constantinople III (ACO² II/1, p. 390, 1–4) has not ‘the flesh’ but ‘the instrument’.

349 Apollinarius, *De fide et incarnatione*, Lietzmann (1904) pp. 198, 24–199, 17.





(4) The same from the treatise on the divine incarnation in its similarity to man.³⁵⁰

And they do not remember that this will is described as proper not to the man from earth, as they suppose, but to the God who came down from heaven.³⁵¹

(5) The same from the work entitled 'On the manifestation of God in the flesh'.³⁵²

For Christ is one and moved by a single divine will, just as we know that his operation is one, proceeding in the various miracles and sufferings of his one nature. For he is, and is believed to be, God enfleshed.

(6) The same from the same work.³⁵³

The words 'Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me, but let not my will but yours be done'³⁵⁴ do not express two different wills at variance with each other but one and the same, which on the one hand operates divinely and on the other deprecates death according to the dispensation, since the one who said this was flesh-bearing God, with no divergence in his will.

(7) The same from the work on the incarnation, Chapter 13.³⁵⁵

The flesh, being totally moved by another, by that which moves and leads it (whatever this may be), and not being completely a living being of itself but compounded so as to become a complete living being, came together into unity with the governing element and was compounded with the heavenly governing element, appropriated by it as regards its own passible element and receiving the divine element appropriated by itself as regards the governing element. For in this way a single living being is constituted from that which is moved and that which moves; it is neither two, nor constituted from two complete and self-moving elements.

350 Apollinarius, *Demonstratio de divina incarnatione*, Lietzmann (1904) 218, 20–3, taken from Gregory of Nyssa, *Antirrheticus adversus Apollinarium*, in *Opera* III/1, p. 180, 8–11.

351 Cp. Jn 6:38, 'I have come down from heaven not to do my own will but the will of him who sent me.'

352 Apollinarius, *In dei in carne manifestationem*, Lietzmann (1904) p. 232, 29–32.

353 Ibid., p. 233, 2–8.

354 Mt 26:39, Lk 22:42.

355 Apollinarius, *Demonstratio*, Lietzmann (1904) p. 232, 10–18.





350 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

(8) [324] Polemon, disciple of Apollinarius, from the *Antirrheticus* against the holy fathers:³⁵⁶

For Christ was wholly God; he was united to the completeness of the flesh and so became man, but did not mix with himself a changeable mind, moved by volitions to contrary things according to its nature. Instead, he became the mind for himself, and performed everything divinely with a changeless will. For it is not the case that there is one [will] that is divine and another that is deified (as according to Gregory the Cappadocian),³⁵⁷ since it would then be changeable. For what could be deified could also most certainly become earthy, as in the case of the first Adam.

(9) The same from the Sixth Letter to Timothy:³⁵⁸

He who asserts two wills of Christ, like puffed up persons now and in the past, either makes out the one [Christ] to be two individual Christs, sundered from each other not only by nature but also by animosity, or teaches that the same [person] is in contention with himself. For where there is duality, there is necessarily also division.

(10) Severus, from the address delivered by him at Daphne in the martyrion of St Euphemia:³⁵⁹

We anathematise both the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo, then head of the Church of Rome, and also those who say or have said that the one Jesus Christ our Lord is 'in two natures' after the ineffable and incomprehensible union, and that of these there are correspondingly two operations and specific characters.

(11) The same from the letter to Eleusinius:

Therefore we anathematise those who have defined that the one Christ is 'in two natures' and who assert that each of the natures has its own operation.³⁶⁰

356 Lietzmann (1904) p. 274, 6–12.

357 Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 30.12, 'His [the Saviour's] will was not opposed to God but wholly deified' (see p. 297 above).

358 Lietzmann (1904) p. 275, 22–6.

359 This lost work (*Sermo prosphoneticus*) must date to the period 512–18, when Severus was bishop of Antioch.

360 Severus is thinking of the oft-cited statement in the Tome of Leo, 'Each form operates what is proper to it'.





(12) The same from the letter to Sergius the Grammarian:³⁶¹

For since the one who operates is one, as is also his operation and his operative movement ...

(13) The same from his work against John of holy memory bishop of Caesarea in Palestine:

For the operation is one, that is, the operative movement, as is also the voice of the incarnate Word.

(14) [326] The same from the first letter to Oecumenius:

The propriety³⁶² in the operations, about which Leo primate of Rome said, 'For each form in communion with the other operates what is proper to it,' would not be called propriety by orthodox people.

(15) {The heretic Severus, from his work addressed to the heretic John then bishop of Alexandria:}³⁶³

The Council of Chalcedon defined the faith by addition and innovation and divided into two the one who was incarnate and became man for our sake, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ, the saviour and redeemer of our race, affirming that he is acknowledged in two natures, and also their operations and specific characters after the incomprehensible and ineffable union, and, as an interpretation of its own definition, calling the Tome of Leo (the head of the Church of Rome) a 'pillar' of orthodoxy.³⁶⁴

(16) The heretic Theodosius, bishop of Alexandria, from the Tome to the empress Theodora:³⁶⁵

361 From Severus' First Letter to Sergius. For the context see the Syriac version in Torrance (1988) 153.

362 *ιδιότης* – meaning individuality (in the following passage I translate the same word as 'specific character'). Severus, anticipating monoenergism, rejected the notion of two individual and distinct operations in Christ in favour of the notion of a single theandric operation. But Leo's 'with the communion of the other' is virtually equivalent.

363 Supplied from the Latin, the Greek having (erroneously) 'The same from the same letter.'

364 The Chalcedonian Definition commends Leo's Tome as 'a universal pillar against those with false beliefs' (Price and Gaddis (2005) II, 203) but not as an authoritative interpretation of the Definition itself.

365 Theodosius (miaphysite patriarch of Alexandria 535–66) dedicated to the empress Theodora a refutation of the Agnoete Christology of Themistius, for whom see Di Berardino (2006) 352–4.





... with the consequence that there is a single divine operation of both, since we attribute to one and the same all that is divine and the blameless emotions.³⁶⁶

(17) The same shortly afterwards:³⁶⁷

The holy and wise fathers taught that in respect of his Godhead and his manhood the divine operation and will are one.

(18) Themistius the heresiarch of the Agnoetes and [an adherent] of the wretched heresy of Severus, Chapter 41 of the Tome sent to the empress Theodora by Theodosius the heresiarch of the Theodosians:³⁶⁸

For we are not, because the sacred Athanasius said that Christ displays two volitions at the time of his passion,³⁶⁹ going for this reason to ascribe two wills to him, and these fighting with each other according to these syllogisms of yours, but we shall piously acknowledge that the one will (since of the one Emmanuel) is in part moved humanly and in part divinely.

(19) [328] The same from Book III of the treatise against Colluthus, Chapter 52, who wrote in defence of the Tome of Theodosius:³⁷⁰

I assert that the knowledge and operation of Emmanuel are one, as is also his will. Therefore consider: this [person], being immutable as God and superior to every passion, when moved humanly in volition, deprecates the passion, and when again moved divinely, regains courage as regards the passion, both of these being through the flesh.

(20) The same from the letter written by him to the people of Salamis:³⁷¹

366 Cp. the wording of the same citation in the Acts of Constantinople III (ACO² II/1, p. 380, 8–11): ‘... we attribute to one and the same both the divine miracles and all the natural and blameless emotions that he voluntarily experienced for us in his own flesh.’

367 Cp. the very similar statement in a Syriac fragment of this work, in Van Roey and Allen (1994) p. 55, 485–6.

368 A fuller version of this passage is given in the Acts of Constantinople III (ACO² II/1, p. 370, 6–14), where it is headed, with less confusion, as ‘Themistius, from his Second *Antirrheticus* against the Tome of Theodosius, Chapter 41’.

369 This passage from Ps.-Athanasius is given above, p. 323, §15.

370 Colluthus had composed against Themistius a defence of Theodosius’ Tome (Di Berardino (2006) 353).

371 The reading in the Greek, ‘from the people of Salamis’, is an obvious error; cp. the heading to the same passage in the *Doctrina patrum*, p. 314, ‘Themistius the Agnoete from the letter written by him to the people of Salamis’. The Latin corrects the text to ‘on behalf





For Christ's knowledge was one, as were also his will and operation. For the one knowing was one, just as, of course, was the one willing and operating.³⁷²

(21) The same from the summary work to the monk Charisius:

For we say that the knowledge of Christ is one, as of one [person], and that his operation is one, as of one and the same.

(22) The same against what had been written by Constantine bishop of Laodicea:

We say that the operation of Christ is one, as is his nature.

(23) The same against those saying that 'because the one operation of Christ was divine, his manhood possessed knowledge of everything':

... since the operation in Christ was simply one, of whatever kind it happened to be, whether divine or appropriate to the manhood; for he who was operating, manifestly the Word of God made man, was one in all respects.

(24) The same from the Defence of the Twenty Chapters addressed to the assembly of monks:

We say that the operation of the whole was always one, both in the divine signs and the human operations of Christ.

(25) {The same from the Defence against the objections of the most wicked ...}.³⁷³

For Christ's knowledge was otherwise one, since so also was his operation; for he was one and the same when knowing and operating, whether humanly or divinely.

(26) [330] The same from the letter to the presbyter Marcellus and the deacon Stephen:

And in another letter, most honourable fathers, we have entreated your

of the people of Salamis'. The same extract was cited at Constantinople III, where it is attributed to Themistius, 'First *Antirrheticus* against the Tome of Theodosius, Chapter 5' (ACO² II/1, p. 374, 6–10).

372 The version of this text in the Acts of Constantinople shows that the two references to will are both interpolations.

373 Supplied from the Latin, which is itself incomplete.





354 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

sacredness not to be angry with us for saying that the one and the same Christ had one and the same knowledge and operation as God and man.

(27) The same to the same:

On what you have written often, your holinesses, namely that it is necessary to affirm that the operation of Christ is one but not to add ‘and the same’,³⁷⁴ I have already replied to you at various times. Now also, no less, I write the same, that it is one as of one [person] and ‘the same’ as of the same.

(28) The heretic Colluthus, from the Defence of the Tome of the heretic Theodosius:

If Christ’s will is one, as you affirm, moved in part divinely and in part humanly, so too and no differently the knowledge of the one [person] is one.

(29) The same from the work against Themistius and in defence of Theodosius:

Our blessed pope³⁷⁵ Theodosius declared that there is one divine operation in Christ in this sense, looking not to the difference of the actions accomplished, but indicating the Saviour’s operative power.

(30) The same from the Defence of Theodosius:

Christ’s will is one, even if it was moved at times divinely and at times humanly. In the same way and not otherwise, the knowledge of the one [person] is also one.

(31) The same from the same work:

The discussion was of operation, [O you] most clever of orators, and you concerned yourself with the things operated. Christ’s operation is one, you wise man: it is not one and another, but rather the same.

(32) [332] The same from the same work:

We speak in this way and not differently about the operation as well. For it is acknowledged by the fathers to be divine, since the Almighty

³⁷⁴ Presumably the objection was Christ’s theandric operation was indeed ‘one’ but that to say his divine and human operation was ‘the same’ was to confuse Godhead and manhood.

³⁷⁵ ‘Pope’, then as now, is a title ascribed to the patriarch of Alexandria.





prevailed,³⁷⁶ but the things accomplished by it, as we have been taught, are various, both divine and human.

(33) The heretic Julian, who was bishop of Halicarnassus, from the work against the Manichees:

If anyone after the ineffable and incomprehensible union dares to assert two natures or two essences or two operations, which is to assert two persons and two hypostases, let him be anathema.

VI. Passages from the heretics who assert division³⁷⁷

(1) Theodore, who was the impious bishop of Mopsuestia, from *On Miracles*, Book 2:³⁷⁸

The Saviour, when he said to the leper ‘I will it: be cleansed’,³⁷⁹ showed that his will was one, and his operation one, proceeding according to one and the same authority, not by reason of nature but of good pleasure, according to which there was united to God the Word the man who came from the seed of David according to foreknowledge, possessing from the very womb an immanent relation with him.

(2) The same from his work on the incarnation:

Presented according to the foreknowledge of the Word, the man born from the Virgin without seed was not separated from the Word, being joined to him in identity of intention, according to which, being well pleased, he [the Word] united him to himself and showed him to be indistinguishable from himself in operation,³⁸⁰ possessing inseparably the same authority and sway and also identical worship, as required by their equality.

(3) Nestorius, from the work he called *The manifest initiation*, Book II:³⁸¹

We keep the natures unconfused, conjoined not in essence but in

376 In other words, the one operation in Christ was ‘divine’ in the sense not that there was no human element, but that the divine element prevailed.

377 The Nestorians.

378 Since no work by Theodore with this title is known, this citation is not likely to be authentic.

379 Mt 8:3, Lk 5:13.

380 I emend καὶ τὴν ἐνέργειαν to κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν in view of the Latin version ‘secundum operationem’. This citation appears to be our only source for this fragment.

381 This and the following citation, from a work otherwise unknown, are judged to be inauthentic by Loofs (1905) iii, 223–4.





intention. And so we perceive their will, operation and sovereignty to be one, revealed by equality of honour. For God the Word, having assumed the man he had preordained in respect of authority, was not separated from him, on account of the latter's foreknown disposition.

(4) [334] The same from the same treatise, Book IV:

God the Word and the man in whom he came to be were not distinct individuals, for the personhood of both was one, worshipped with dignity and honour by the whole creation, in no way and at no time divided by difference of volition and will.

(5) The same from the letter to Alexander of Hierapolis:

The two natures have one authority and one power or sovereignty and one personhood, in virtue of one dignity and the same honour.

(6) Paul the Deacon, a Persian Nestorian, from his work on Judgement:

Since the union of God the Word with the man he assumed was not according to essence, the result was not one nature; and if there was not one nature, Christ is not one hypostasis with a single personhood. Therefore the union was according to good pleasure, secured by identity of volition and intention, where the difference of the natures is displayed without fusion and the mystery of good pleasure is proved by soleness of volition.

(7) Theodulus the Nestorian, from Book II of his work *On the harmony of the Old and New Testaments*:

Therefore the dignity of the king and of the image is one, and both have one operation.

(8) The same from the same work:

For, furthermore, he manifestly receives from all 'the honour of kingship'.³⁸² For, furthermore, the dignity of the image and that of God who set it up is one, and both have one operation.

(9) From the supposed letter of Ibas which was justly anathematised by the holy fifth council:³⁸³

³⁸² Dan 4:36.

³⁸³ The Letter of Ibas to Mari the Persian, ACO II. 1, pp. 391, 31–392, 1, trans. Price (2009) II, 7.





For what the church says, as your religiousness knows, and what has been taught from the beginning and confirmed by the divine teaching of the writings of the blessed fathers, is this: two natures, one power.

[336] Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Concerning the statements that have just been read to us from the ill-named heretics, Cyrus and Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul embraced and approved them in concord, since manifestly they laid down as doctrine what we have found in the former [the heretics], even if, to deceive the more simple, they asserted that these were 'the doctrines of piety'.³⁸⁴ They did not fear the curse that runs, 'Woe to those who call evil good and good evil, who make darkness light and light darkness, who make the bitter sweet and the sweet bitter. Woe to those who are wise in themselves and knowledgeable in their own sight, who justify the impious one and deprive the righteous one of his right. Therefore, in the same way that straw will be burned by a coal of fire, so their root will be as chaff, and their flower rise up like dust. For they did not want the law of the Lord of hosts, and he laid his hand upon them and struck them,' as Isaiah says.³⁸⁵

Therefore, on account of the opinions that in this way they adopted and jumbled together, it is fitting to say to them what the Lord again said to them through the prophet Samuel: 'Because you have rejected the word of the Lord, the Lord also will reject you'³⁸⁶ from being bishops of the catholic church. For they have manifestly 'rejected the word' of the faith of the Lord, perverting its orthodox profession, which the approved fathers of the catholic church and the holy five councils proclaimed in unison. Therefore, by displaying the total completeness of their agreement with the heretics, they have striven to join them not only in saying the same things, but also in doing the same things. For saying what the heretics say was not enough to display perfect accord, but [it was necessary] also to contradict what they contradict, and to use not different but the same expressions. Because of this they too publicised the war against the holy fathers that they have waged together with them, when they wrote in their *Ekthesis* as follows:³⁸⁷

Likewise the phrase 'two operations' scandalises many, because it was not

384 Citing the *Ekthesis*, p. 229 above.

385 Is 5:20–5.

386 1 Kgs (= 1 Sam) 15:23.

387 The *Ekthesis*, p. 229.





used by any of the holy and approved enlighteners of the catholic church, and because there also follows from it an assertion of two wills opposed to each other, with God the Word willing the accomplishment of the saving passion and his manhood resisting and opposing his will; this introduces two [persons] with opposing wills, which is impious and alien to Christian doctrine. For if even the abominable Nestorius ... did not dare to attribute two wills to them, but on the contrary taught an identity of volition in the two persons he invented, how is it possible for those who profess the orthodox faith ... to accept in his case two wills and these in opposition to each other? Therefore, following the holy fathers in this as in everything, we profess one will in our Lord Jesus Christ.

[338] In addition, in his own letter Pyrrhus' successor Paul spoke in the same way:³⁸⁸

For this reason we also conceive of one will in our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, lest we attribute either opposition or difference of wills to the one and the same person of our Lord Jesus Christ, or define that he was opposed to himself, or introduce a duality of [persons] willing ... Let us interpret the saying in the gospel, '[I have come down from heaven] not to do my own will but that of him who sent me',³⁸⁹ and the deprecation of the cup³⁹⁰ without introducing in the one Christ a differing and resistant will, and let us understand this saying negatively rather than affirmatively, for it is a statement not of what *is* but of what is not, according to that accurate expert on doctrine, Gregory the Theologian,³⁹¹ ... but this does not mean that the flesh (with its intellectual soul) of God the Word was averse to the suffering salvific for the world or at variance with the Father and with the indwelling Word. For we accept the most precise expositor and interpreter of this understanding, Cyril the two-edged spear of the Spirit ... who, in the fourth of [his] anathematisms of what in contradiction of the Twelve Chapters had been written by Theodoret ... expounded and explained the saying in the gospel.³⁹²

With this Pyrrhus himself expresses agreement in the letter written by him to the sainted pope John, when he says the following:³⁹³

I for my part hold that it is not possible for two wills to co-exist in one person, necessarily opposed and resistant to each other. For when the divine teacher

388 From Paul of Constantinople, Letter to Pope Theodore, pp. 258–9 above.

389 Jn 6:38.

390 Mt 26:39, Lk 22:42.

391 Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 30.12, which I discussed above, pp. 297–8.

392 Namely Mt 26:39, 'Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me.'

393 For this see letter, dating to 641, see Winkelmann (2001) 99.





said in anticipation, 'For his will was not contrary to God but wholly deified',³⁹⁴ lest any might suppose that Christ's statement here was made positively, he made the fact yet more plain by stating that the saying was uttered by the one who assumed, not by what was assumed.³⁹⁵

Observe clearly, as has already been said, that they not only taught the same as the heretics, but also made war on our holy fathers in their statements (or rather syllogistic frivolities), lawlessly discharging the darts of their words against those who speak of God, which means the same as against God's catholic and apostolic church, while pretending to fight against us. This we shall demonstrate still more clearly by a reciprocal comparison of what was written by each of the parties and has just now been read to us, distinguishing in sequence (that is) between the old heretics and the authors of the outlandish innovation.

(1) This is what the heretics said: 'He who asserts two wills, like puffed up persons now and in the past, either makes out the one [Christ] to be two individual Christs, sundered from each other not only by nature but also by animosity, or teaches that he is in contention with himself.'³⁹⁶

The authors of the innovation said: 'For this reason we assert one will, lest we define that he contends with himself, or introduce a duality of [persons] willing.'³⁹⁷

(2) [340] The heretics said: 'For it is not the case that there is one [will] that is divine and another that is deified (as according to Gregory the Cappadocian) ... for where there is duality, there is necessarily also division.'³⁹⁸

The authors of the innovation said: 'It is not possible for two wills to co-exist in one person, necessarily opposed and resistant to each other.'³⁹⁹

(3) The heretics said: 'For we are not, because the sacred Athanasius said that Christ displayed two volitions at the time of his passion, going for this

394 This also is a reference to Gregory's interpretation of Jn 6:38 in *or.* 30.12.

395 The *Ekthesis* had affirmed one will in Christ without emphasis. It was this letter from Pyrrhus (for which see also Pope John's comments in his letter to Constantine III, Winkelmann (2001) 97–8) that brought monotheletism to the centre of the debate.

396 Polemon on p. 350, §9.

397 Paul of Constantinople on p. 358.

398 Polemon on p. 350, §§8 and 9 *fin.*

399 Pyrrhus on p. 358.





360 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

reason to attach two wills to him, and these fighting with each other, but we shall piously acknowledge the one will, since of the one Emmanuel.⁴⁰⁰

The authors of the innovation said: ‘And [in] the deprecation of the cup we do not introduce in the one Christ a different and resistant will.⁴⁰¹ ‘Therefore, following the holy fathers in this as in everything, we profess one will in the Lord.’⁴⁰²

(4) The heretics said: ‘The propriety in the operations, about which Leo primate of Rome said, “For each form in communion with the other operates what is proper to it,” would not be called by the orthodox “propriety” in the case of Christ, for there is not in the operations of Christ a stable propriety.’⁴⁰³ ‘We therefore anathematise the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo, and those who say or have said that the one Christ is “in two natures” after the union, and that of these there are correspondingly operations and specific characters.’⁴⁰⁴

The authors of the innovation said: ‘Likewise the phrase “two operations” scandalises many, because it was not used by any of the holy and approved enlighteners of the church.’⁴⁰⁵ ‘If anyone, therefore, from now on disdains the prohibition, we decree that, if he is a bishop or presbyter or deacon, he is stripped of all priestly service and ministry, while if he is a monk or layman, we exclude him from holy communion.’⁴⁰⁶

(5) [342] The heretics said: ‘Therefore we know that his operation is one, proceeding in the various miracles and sufferings of his one nature.’⁴⁰⁷

The authors of the innovation said: ‘It was by one operation that the one and the same Christ performed both what is divine and what is human.’⁴⁰⁸ ‘It was in agreement with this pious conception that Leo archbishop of Rome believed and taught when he said, “For each form operates in communion with the other.”’⁴⁰⁹

400 Themistius on p. 352, §18.

401 Paul on p. 358.

402 From the *Ekthesis*, p. 229.

403 Severus on p. 351, §14, the last line (from ‘in the case of Christ’) being an addition.

404 Severus on p. 350, §10.

405 From the *Ekthesis*, p. 229.

406 From the Acts of the Synod of Constantinople of 638, p. 232.

407 Apollinarius on p. 349, §5.

408 Cyrus of Alexandria on p. 212.

409 Sergius of Constantinople on p. 214.





Since, therefore, one and the same heresy has been found in both, and the same contradiction of the holy fathers, it is necessary to apply without reserve the same penalty as well, or rather a greater and more severe one to these latter, for the reason that they were not chastened by the punishment of the heretics who preceded them, but even thought up in their yet more wicked minds something yet more wicked than their predecessors had done, by having the audacity to assert, for the seduction of the more innocent, that they ‘follow the holy fathers in this as in everything’, and that these are the doctrines of the holy council at Chalcedon and of the blessed Leo and of simply all the holy fathers and councils,⁴¹⁰ which is something that the earlier heretics in no way dared to affirm, but instead they acknowledged, by criticising them, that to Gregory the Cappadocian belongs the attribution to Christ of a divine will and a deified will, that the sacred Athanasius upheld two wills, divine and human, and that the blessed Leo and the holy council at Chalcedon proclaimed two particularities and operations as well as natures.⁴¹¹

The advocates of the innovation have refused to admit this, surpassing in mendacity the heretics who preceded them, with the intention of making their ill-favoured heresy acceptable by giving it a well-favoured name, even though it is very easily detected and has been exposed to all as incoherent. For how is it possible, as they claim, to ‘follow the holy fathers’ and yet openly profess the tenets of the heretics? For (as has already been said) they adduced in their *Ekthesis* no citation from the approved fathers to confirm their profession, but they cited as agreeing with them only the senseless ‘identity of volition’ of ‘the abominable Nestorius’, when they said, ‘How is it possible for them to advocate two wills, when not even Nestorius dared to profess this in the case of the two persons he invented?’⁴¹² Therefore, following him in this as in everything, they did not dare to assert two wills, but agreed with him in declaring one [will] in virtue of ‘identity of volition’, and thereby became justly liable to the same condemnation as he did.

[344] Maximus the most holy bishop of Aquileia said:

The prophetic utterance has been fulfilled by them, ‘They were greatly put to shame, because they did not realise their disgraces, which

410 From the *Ekthesis*, p. 229.

411 Pyrrhus cited Gregory (p. 358), Themistius cited Athanasius (p. 352, §18), and Severus cited Chalcedon and Leo (p. 350, §10).

412 From the *Ekthesis*, p. 229.





will never be forgotten,⁴¹³ especially through their saying in ignorance, ‘From the expression “two operations” there most certainly follow two wills opposed to each other.’⁴¹⁴ For if they attribute no opposition to the operations, how can they attempt to deduce opposed wills from operations that according to them are not opposed? Or how again can they say that wills follow from operations, and yet refuse to acknowledge that they follow from the natures? In consequence they now declare the operations to be voluntary, yet they do not profess Christ to be endowed with will in each of his natures, but state he is without will in respect of nature.

This notwithstanding, in what sense do they say that wills follow from operations? Is this according to nature, or contrary to nature? If it is contrary to nature, they are describing Christ as a sinful human being and not as God made man, since in their view the will he possesses is contrary to nature. And if it is according to nature, then they are describing him as being by nature a single composite nature, in consequence of their ascribing to him a single natural will, if indeed they are asserting that will follows from operation according to nature. The result is that they are certainly professing either division or fusion – the former if they teach that will follows from operation contrary to nature, the latter if they teach that it does so according to nature. But if they assert that will follows from operation neither according to nature nor contrary to nature, they are declaring it non-existent and their own account to be nonsensical.

And how can they change the natural difference of the wills of the one and the same Christ into a personal opposition between persons willing things contrary to each other, as a result of their asserting and making out that, if God the Word willed the salvific passion to be accomplished while his flesh opposed and resisted his will, this introduces two [persons] willing contrary things? For plainly as a result of their argumentation they have been caught ensnared in their own toils. For when making the assertion that it is persons who wish (as they suppose) contrary things, they were unaware that they had asserted, by the nature of the case, that it is persons who will identical things. For if from a contrariety of wills they deduce two [persons] willing contrary things, it is then necessary for them likewise from harmony of wills to deduce two [persons] willing identical things, for they must certainly make the flesh either in harmony or in opposition to the

413 Jer 20:11.

414 Cp. the *Ekthesis*, p. 229.





Word, unless with Arius and Apollinarius they imagine it to be completely without soul and motion.

Moreover, because they define that, since the Christ who operates and wills is one, his operation and will are one (since they affirm that will is to be ascribed to the one willing and operation to the one operating), they are therefore obliged (since the Father who wills and operates is one, and since the Holy Spirit who wills and operates is one) to separate the three hypostases of the unoriginate and sole Godhead by [postulating] three wills and operations, which is something utterly forbidden. For they are unaware that, though indeed [346] will is to be ascribed to the one willing and operation to the one operating, this is not ‘the one willing’ without qualification, but the one willing according to nature, and not ‘the one operating’ without qualification, but the one operating according to nature; and this is clear from the fact that each of these [will and operation] derive their name from the nature of the one operating and willing; for so it is that we call the will and operation of a man human, that of an angel angelic and that of God divine. Therefore the teachers of the catholic church attribute both, I mean the divine and the human, to the same [person] as God and man, introducing no dissension in consequence of them, but showing that his existence was complete in each of the natures from which he was constituted. For we recognise that dissension arises not from an acknowledgement of his natures or his natural wills and operations, but from sin alone. The Lord, being completely free of sin and indeed the destroyer of it, was also free of the dissension we experience.

Our opponents stand convicted of again dividing him into two, in consequence of the reason they proffer for defining one will, when they assert, ‘... since at no time did the flesh with its intellectual soul make its natural movement separately and of its own impulse in opposition to the bidding of God the Word hypostatically united to it, but when, how, and to the extent that God the Word himself resolved.’⁴¹⁵ For in saying this they have been even more divisive than Nestorius, in that Nestorius defined both the union and the movement by reference not to a certain ‘bidding’, as they do, but to the dignity, authority and equality in honour of the man assumed (according to him) by the Word, since virtually all the saints followed the divine bidding at all times, in all their natural and spontaneous movement. Of them it is written, ‘All his volitions are in them.’⁴¹⁶ How then can they –

415 From the *Ekthesis*, p. 229.

416 Ps 15:3.





taking what pertains to the saints, not to say to everything that exists (since it is acknowledged that all things perform their natural movement according to the bidding and injunction of God, in due time and due measure and in the form wisely determined by him, as appropriate for each) – think it right to attribute this, as if it were some great and supernatural thing, to the flesh (with its intellectual soul) of the Lord, by saying that it made its natural movement according to his bidding? Are they saying that it made this its natural movement willingly or unwillingly? If it did so unwillingly, they are calling it irrational, and if willingly, they are representing it as exercising choice,⁴¹⁷ if indeed they separate it from the Word by stating that it makes its natural movement at his bidding, like the rest of creation, brought into being by him (as has already been said), rather than stating that the same one Christ, being by nature both God and man and being moved both divinely and humanly, performs both the divine and the human [operations] naturally and willingly without any dissension or separation whatsoever.

For according to the teaching of the holy fathers, the one and the same Jesus Christ our Lord died on behalf of all on the one hand voluntarily, in that the divine nature so willed it, and on the other hand involuntarily, on account of the sufferings of the cross and as far as relates to the natural deprecation of death by the flesh.⁴¹⁸ Accordingly theologians teach that the willing and the aversion of the one and the same Christ did not result from an opposition of wills but were brought about by the facts of the mystery, [348] in that the same in truth fully revealed about himself the rationale both of his creative activity and of the dispensation – that of his creative activity in his willing (having become man for us) to confirm the nature of his flesh by (for this reason) voluntarily accepting its natural timidity (in order to free us from this as from every other passion, for ‘he was tempted in everything like us apart from sin’)⁴¹⁹ and that of the dispensation in his willing (in his paternal and ineffable intention)⁴²⁰ to make our nature divine by suffering voluntarily in the flesh for our sake. What, then, and of what kind is the dissension in respect of these two that is thought up by both the ancient and the new heretics concerning our Saviour – a dissension through which they try to abolish the great mystery of his dispensation relating to us? For not only do they reject a duality of

417 For St Maximus’ denial of choice to Christ’s human will see p. 98 above.

418 Cp. Cyril of Alexandria on p. 331 above, §§38–9.

419 Heb 4:15.

420 That is, in the divine will he shares with the Father.





wills in his case, but they also refuse to acknowledge that these belong to the natures. Therefore they contrive to exclude number by [invoking] dissension, and to exclude calling them natural by [invoking] necessity, since they make everything natural subject to necessity. And if they do this, why do they not proceed to do away with all the natural properties of our Saviour, including his union in essence, his natural goodness, and choice being a fruit of nature, and in a word everything, if theologians have called anything about him natural or adhering to him by nature? But the blessed Cyril rightly puts them to shame together with those he had already and wisely shamed for this reason, in his defence of the third of his Twelve Chapters, where he speaks as follows against those who criticised him by inferring that he taught an absence of will because of the natural union:⁴²¹

That his [Theodoret's] argument is utterly ill-considered can easily be perceived by those willing to do so. For he said that what is according to nature will be wholly and totally subject to the laws of necessity, and adduced as proof the fact that we experience hunger and thirst involuntarily, at the behest of nature, even if someone does not wish it. But an intelligent man with an acute mind in these and other matters would perceive what would rightly be considered more in accordance with reason. For is it not true that man is rational by nature? Is he therefore rational involuntarily and under compulsion? What then? Tell me: is the God of the universe not good by nature? Is he not life, light, wisdom and power? Is this, then, contrary to his will and as if under compulsion? But I think that to choose this opinion would be clear evidence of utter folly.

And again the same in the work dedicated to Hermias: 'For he is not involuntarily what he is naturally, since he possesses, corresponding to nature, the will to be what he is.'⁴²²

Saint Augustine in the fifth book of his treatise against Julian the Pelagian concurs with this, when he says: 'Surely, Julian, when an angel or man wills anything at all, does not their nature will it? Are not an angel and a man natures? Who would say that they are not? If, therefore, an angel and a man are natures, it is plain that nature wills whatever an angel wills, and that nature wills whatever a man wills.'⁴²³ [350] And again elsewhere in the same book: 'Surely, Julian, the will of man proceeds from man? In

421 Cyril, *Defence of the Twelve Chapters*, ACO I. 1/6, p. 119, 7–17.

422 Cyril, *Dialogues on the Trinity* 2, SC 231, (456) 46–8, already cited at p. 315, §10.

423 Augustine, *Contra Julianum opus imperfectum* V. 53, CSEL 85.2, p. 258, 14–18, in an exact citation. The wording in the Latin Acts of both this and the following citation is a retroversion from the Greek, which shows that they came from a Greek florilegium.





what way does it proceed from man, if it does not proceed from his nature, since man is a nature.⁴²⁴

Mark how clearly the inspired teaching of the holy fathers has instructed us that, for those who have received from God the possession of will in their essence, will belongs to nature, and as a result acts of will are natural and free of all necessity, and that to choose a view different from this is foolish and ignorant. But they who say that the will they attribute to Christ does not exist according to nature thereby define that it is contrary to nature, and in consequence (as we have said already) they describe the Lord, who is the destroyer of sin, as himself sinful. In consequence they openly reject, or interpret ignorantly, the teaching of the holy fathers. For in this way Paul in his letter, slipping in the saying about the passion and the deprecation of the cup, craftily connected it to the statement that the Son came down from heaven not to do his own will but that of him who sent him, which had been taken by Saint Gregory [the Theologian] to refer to the Godhead, namely the divine will of the holy and consubstantial Trinity.⁴²⁵ He deceived himself, rather than misleading others, in his novel claim that the statement had been taken by the Theologian to relate to both [the divine and human wills], in order to annul his teaching, as I have said, and abolish the human will of the Saviour, I mean the one which was wholly deified, as the teacher said. Even before Paul, Pyrrhus misinterpreted this for the same reason⁴²⁶ and took 'wholly deified' to refer to the Godhead, with the result that both of them described the will of the Holy Trinity as created, since it was 'deified' according to them, and consequently the nature also (since will wholly corresponds to nature),⁴²⁷ an impiety that convicts their innovation of perverting the words of the fathers. For the Theologian did not take the deprecation of the cup to refer to the Godhead; but in agreement with all the holy fathers he piously interpreted this saying to refer to the human will of the Saviour, not to opposition or ignorance, as the heretics conceive – 'for it is not likely that he did not know whether it was possible or not, or that he opposed will to will', 'for his will was not opposed to God but wholly deified'⁴²⁸ – but [he wrote this] for the sake of a true demonstration

424 A free paraphrase of *ibid.* V. 56, CSEL 85.2, p. 263, 11–17. Contrast the exact citation of this passage in the Acts of Constantinople III, ACO² II/1, p. 78, 17–20 (Latin, p. 79, 15–18).

425 Cp. Paul on p. 258 commenting on Gregory Nazianzen's exegesis of Jn 6:38.

426 Pyrrhus as cited on p. 358.

427 Echoing the sentence from Cyril of Alexandria's 'work dedicated to Hermias' cited on the previous page.

428 These quotations from Gregory Nazianzen were cited above, pp. 324–5, §§20–1.





that he became fully human for our sake, since he ‘laboured’, ‘hungered’, ‘was thirsty’, ‘was in anguish’ and ‘wept’⁴²⁹ according to the law of the body; these words occur in scripture in relation to that which suffered, not (as is obvious to all) in relation to the immutable nature, which transcends suffering.

[352] Therefore it was not in contradiction of himself or the other saints that the teacher attributed the deprecation in this passage to ourselves and elsewhere to the Saviour, but it was in complete accord with himself and them that he denied opposition and taught a ‘deified’ will, namely the human one, just as he taught a divine and uncreated nature in the case of God the Word incarnate, who became a complete human being for our sake, purifying the like with like and healing the natural properties of our nature through all that was his own, according to the true and philanthropic tradition of the mystery. By rejecting this mystery, the authors of the innovation have wandered off into heretical myths,⁴³⁰ having through their innovation forfeited the teaching of piety.

Deusdedit the most holy bishop of Cagliari said:

For the complete refutation of the said heretics, namely the authors of this innovation, it is most pertinent that again we bring to the fore Saint Cyril, in that passage of the teacher that they have cited,⁴³¹ namely his defence of the fourth of the Twelve Chapters, particularly since they have said that they receive him invariably as the expounder and interpreter of the pious understanding of the doctrines taught about Christ God. Now in this defence against those who had criticised him and advanced points of dissension with him, or rather impugned the mystery of the dispensation, because he attributed all the sayings about him in the holy gospels to one and the same God the Word incarnate, the teacher spoke clearly as follows:⁴³²

But he⁴³³ supposes that he said something wise and irrefutable. For if the Word of God (he says) is the one who cried out, ‘Father, if it is possible, let this cup

429 Jn 4:6, Mt 4:2, Jn 19:28, Lk 22:44, Jn 11:35. Maximus is echoing Gregory, *or.* 29.18, SC 250, p. 214, 10–11.

430 Cp. 2 Tim 4:4.

431 Cited by Paul of Constantinople in his letter to Pope Theodore, p. 259.

432 Cyril, *Defence of the Twelve Chapters*, ACO I. 1/6, pp. 124,30–125,27.

433 Cyril is responding to Theodoret (*ibid.*, p. 122), who argued that recoiling from the cup of the passion, in apparent ignorance that it would save the world, cannot be attributed to God the Word but only to ‘the form of the servant’ which he assumed.





pass from me,⁴³⁴ firstly he is dissenting from the Father, and he also wrongly declines to drink the cup, even though (he says) he was not ignorant that his suffering was going to save the world; therefore (he says) such utterances cannot be those of God the Word. One who indulges in such spurious arguments will hear this in reply from us: since, therefore, it seems to you that such utterances should be excluded from God the Word and ought only to be attributed to the form of a servant, do you then divide the one into two sons? Who of the right-minded will find this a puzzle? Perhaps someone will say (following your reasoning, my good man) that it is incredible and contrary to proper reason for [even] the form of a servant to deprecate the suffering and to be seen to be dissenting from the Father and the indwelling Word, for he knew (I presume) that the suffering would be for the salvation of those under heaven and would procure life for those conquered by death, and therefore he ought to have been seen to be above timidity and to have chosen to follow the divine commands.⁴³⁵

– Are you really unaware that you have uttered nonsense at random? What is this great confusion in your thoughts? I myself [354] would say without any hesitation that everything human is small for the Word born of God; I ask whom he supposes to have undergone the self-emptying and who suffered this willingly? For if, as they assert, it was the form of a servant or that from the seed of David, how or in what way was it ‘emptied’, if it was assumed by God? If it is the Word himself (being in form of God and equal to him) who is said to have emptied himself, how again or in what way was he emptied, if he deprecated the emptying? Self-emptying for the Word of God, who is without knowledge of suffering change, consists of doing or saying something human because of the union with flesh in the dispensation. But if he indeed became man, the principle of the mystery can in no way harm him in his own nature; for he remained what he was, even when he reached down into manhood for the salvation and life of the world. Therefore we shall attribute the sayings in the gospels and the holy apostles not to two persons but to the one Christ and Son and God, neither diminishing his divine nature and glory on account of what was human, nor denying the dispensation, but believing that it happened to the Word himself, who for our sake became man.

Note clearly how the teacher refuted the pestilence of heresy, I mean the monstrous dissension of wills which the ignorant try to introduce in the case of our Saviour, and how he called them ‘spurious arguments’ and

434 Mt 26:39.

435 Cyril is not arguing (as St Maximus was to do) that Christ’s human will never refused the cup, but that attributing this to his manhood in separation from God the Word denies the reality of the incarnation, where the Word ‘emptied himself’ (Phil 2:7). Cyril’s own answer was that God the Word did indeed take on human weakness, as this was the only way to destroy it. See a passage from Cyril cited above, p. 330, §37.





a 'confusion of wicked thoughts'. Accordingly, after repelling these people most valiantly and in no way whatever accepting any dissension at all in respect of either the Godhead or manhood of the Only-begotten, since it is heretical and condemned, he sagely approved the self-emptying in the mystery, according to which (he says) God the Word, 'being in the form of God and equal to him', in no way deprecated 'doing or saying something human because of the union with flesh'. For this reason he 'attributes the sayings in the gospels and the holy apostles about him to the one and only Christ and Son and God, neither diminishing his divine nature on account of what was human, nor denying the dispensation' on account of what was divine. Therefore, according to the teaching of the most wise Cyril, they are denying the self-emptying of the only-begotten God, and openly rejecting his philanthropic dispensation on our behalf. They do not attribute to the Saviour himself (having become man for our sake) the words 'Father, if it possible, let this cup pass from me,'⁴³⁶ uttered as proof that he became fully human for our sake and rejected nothing at all of what is ours but confirmed in truth and according to nature everything by which our essence is characterised, save sin alone. Yet they assign to someone other than the Saviour his utterance of this most mystical⁴³⁷ prayer on our behalf and, in a way that abolishes it, declare that he was dissenting [from the Father], since they do not wish to take this saying to relate to him, in accordance with the pious confession of the holy fathers.

As the teacher [Cyril] says:⁴³⁸

The Word of God became man not in order to perform and utter everything again as God before the incarnation, but so that often through the neediness of the dispensation with the flesh he might say certain things as man. Therefore, since [356] the mystery had this power, would it not be absurd for the hearers to take offence at his speaking, at times, in a more human way? For he speaks as man, and also speaks as God, having power in both ways (though not at all experiencing dissension, as the heretics hold).⁴³⁹ For he said humanly, 'Now is my soul troubled,'⁴⁴⁰ and again divinely, 'I have power to lay it down, and I

436 Mt 26:39.

437 'Mystical' in the sense of being part of the 'mystery' of the incarnation.

438 The following quotation is taken from two works of Cyril. The first part (down to 'akin to these') is from *Thesaurus* 24, PG 75. 400A–C and 401B, and the rest from his lost *Commentary on Matthew*, Bk XI – a passage from which two excerpts came in a florilegium above, p. 331, §§38–9.

439 This bracketed clause is an insertion of 649.

440 Jn 12:27.





370 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

have power to take it up again.⁴⁴¹ Being troubled is proper to the flesh, while having power to lay down the soul and take it up again is the work of the power of God the Word. Therefore just as, whenever he says something divine, even though he became man, we are not scandalised but remember the Word united to the flesh, so, whenever he utters something as a man, we are not scandalised but remember that he became man for our sake and utters what is appropriate for the manhood (which he assumed for our sake together with the properties pertaining to it by nature).⁴⁴² ... Proper to manhood is weeping and being troubled, being afraid and deprecating death and the sufferings akin to these ... Even if the whole was not totally and in every respect voluntary for him, nevertheless for the sake of salvation and life for all he made the passion on the cross according to his will.⁴⁴³ For if he had not made the suffering voluntary, even though it was extremely undesired, how then could we understand the reason for his praying and saying, 'Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me'? ... For mark how involuntary was the passion for the Saviour; but when it was utterly and entirely necessary to undergo it for the sake of the blessings that would result from the suffering, he made it voluntary for our sake. For he would not have threatened his betrayer with an affliction exceeding every evil, [saying] that it would have been better for him not to have been born at all,⁴⁴⁴ and would not even have thought him, as ministering to his own [Christ's] wishes, to deserve punishment at all, if his suffering had been voluntary. Since he punishes him as a sinner, how could it not be obvious that he underwent the passion against his will? But that which took place on one occasion, brought about by the madness of the Jews and the malice of the devil, he made by his own power the way of life and salvation for those on earth.

This is what the teacher said, but the former and the present heretics, transgressing the wise injunctions of his words, are not scandalised if they hear the Saviour uttering or performing something divine, but are utterly scandalised if it is something according to human nature, not reflecting that he became man and said and did things appropriate to the manhood he had assumed for our sake together with all its natural properties. But in opposition to the words of the fathers, they think to concoct something more novel, and as a result of their self-willed error they suppose that the Word of God became man in order to perform and utter divinely everything

441 Jn 10:18.

442 The bracketed clause is an insertion of 649.

443 At this point the citation of this passage in the Acts of Constantinople III (ACO² II/1, p. 318, 16–17) supplies an additional sentence: 'For he knew, he knew plainly, the achievements that would result, and that he would renew the human race and acquire it with his own blood for God the Father.'

444 Cp. Mt 26:24.





again as when (before the incarnation) he was simply God, and nothing at all that was human on account of the needs of the dispensation with the flesh. But [they suppose] that the mystery of the dispensation consisted of mere illusion and unreality, since the Word performed and uttered nothing according to our nature; and even if he did utter something (they say), he was simply representing us, and not revealing himself as having become man in essence, while always remaining God by nature.

[358] Because the fathers say that our Lord and God had power in both ways, to speak and operate both divinely and humanly, so as to confirm each of the natures from which he is, and that the passion was for him both voluntary and involuntary, they attempt to bring in dissent in his respect, so as to abolish his natural wills and operations. It is clear that not only do they manifestly deny the mystery of his incarnation, but that they also blaspheme against the doctrine about his Godhead, since they make him out to have been unjust as a result of an indiscriminating punishment, if (in the words of the teacher) he condemned the one who had been ‘minister to his own wishes’. For, stumbling in the darkness of their innovation, they failed to recognise the mystery of God incarnate and, erring for this reason, they perished through their dissent and were wholly consumed by their punishment. For having ignorantly contrived their dissent, for the sake of abolishing the dispensation and annulling the teaching of the fathers, they were expertly routed by the fathers themselves through us their successors, with the result that they fulfil what was sagely spoken by Isaiah, ‘The fool will utter folly and his heart will ponder vain things, to accomplish what is unlawful and utter error to the Lord.’⁴⁴⁵ But what will they do thereafter, says scripture,⁴⁴⁶ when the Lord God brings them all to judgement, so that judgement may be delivered in their case over their acts of impiety against him?

Martin, the most holy and most blessed pope of God’s holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, said:

Since in the said men, the authors of the innovation, ‘there was conceived a stubborn and disobedient heart, for they turned away and departed (according to the scripture) and did not say in their heart, Let us fear the Lord our God’,⁴⁴⁷ we are bidden to proclaim with confidence

445 Is 32:6.

446 Cp. Ezek 20:35.

447 Jer 5:23–4.





his saving power, namely the doctrine of the incarnation, through the trumpets of the Spirit, I mean the holy fathers. Let us listen yet again to the blessed Cyril, as he teaches that apart from sin there is to be denied to our Lord and God Jesus Christ none at all of the natural properties of the ensouled and all-holy flesh united to him hypostatically, but that he willingly experienced them all for the sake of our salvation. For he speaks as follows:⁴⁴⁸

For just as death would not have been abolished had he not died, so is it with each of the emotions of the flesh. For if he had not felt dread, nature would not have become free of dread; if he had not felt distress, there would never have been an end to distress; if he had not been troubled and [360] terrified, it would never have escaped from these things. Applying the same reasoning to each of the human experiences, you will find that the emotions of the flesh were excited in Christ not so that they might prevail as in us, but that, once excited, they might be abolished by the power of the Word who dwelt in the flesh, with nature being changed for the better.

So his incarnation, according to the teaching of the fathers, had this philanthropic purpose – that, as a result of his allowing these wholly blameless emotions to be excited in him according to his will, he should with the fullness of his strength abolish them and free our nature from them, which could not otherwise be freed unless he were to experience them through suffering in the flesh willingly for our sake. It is therefore clear, as we have said repeatedly, that our opponents' mode of dissent denies the doctrine of the dispensation, for they do not acknowledge in accordance with the holy fathers that, just as he destroyed death by death, so too he destroyed our distress by distress, anxiety by anxiety and fear by fear, and in a word all the natural emotions in us through voluntary emotions. For in this way he not only showed himself to have truly become man for the sake of men, by confirming the nature united to himself hypostatically through exhibiting our natural emotions, but also willingly displayed as a bait to the tempter the emotions of his own flesh so that, deceived, he would mount an assault, as is stated by Gregory the Theologian:

He displayed our temptations as an invitation to the tempter, in order to prove the tempter's impotence. For it was right that the one who had deceived should be wholly deceived, and that the one who had tricked Adam into transgression through the hope of godhood⁴⁴⁹ should be worsted by the flesh, so that the

448 Cyril, *Thesaurus* 24, PG 75. 397C, already cited on p. 330, §37.

449 Cp. Gen 3:5.





condemnation of the flesh should be cancelled by flesh, through death being put to death by flesh.⁴⁵⁰

For ‘since by man came death’,⁴⁵¹ it was necessary through the compassion of God incarnate, who through feelings of pity did not overlook his own creation, that life, indestructible by any form of death, be bestowed on our nature, through his cancelling in himself our disobedience through his own obedience. For God incarnate, by offering this obedience humanly for our sake to his own natural begetter (namely God the Father), ‘becoming obedient to him unto death, even death on a cross’,⁴⁵² intended that the fruit of his own surpassing obedience should proceed from him to our nature through his bestowing and achieving in himself our liberation, meaning the way of the cup [of suffering]. It was for this reason that he said with salvific devotion, ‘Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me.’⁴⁵³ And ‘being heard for his devotion’, as the apostle says, ‘and although being the Son’,⁴⁵⁴ he followed this path, abolishing the cup in himself through his venerable and true resurrection in the flesh – the one ‘free among the dead’⁴⁵⁵ becoming ‘the first-born from the dead’⁴⁵⁶ – so that he might be revealed as in truth our liberator, after we had become dead through sin. For this was the will of God the Father and the only-begotten Son and the all-holy Spirit (namely the naturally unoriginate and sole Godhead, perceived in its essence in the three), that through the Son’s consorting with us bodily and **[362]** fulfilling for our sake his paternal (that is, divine) will, as also humanly through obedience, our cup (namely the penalty of death) should be abolished, through ‘the mortal being swallowed up by life’.⁴⁵⁷ For this purpose, by adopting them and uniting them to himself hypostatically, he healed all the elements of our nature – body, soul, mind, operation and will – through which Adam had willingly transgressed the commandment.

450 A free citation of Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 39.13 (SC 358, p. 178, 22–7), which runs: ‘Since the contriver of evil thought himself invincible, having tricked us with the hope of godhood, so he was tricked by the display of the flesh, with the result that, when assailing Adam, he encountered God, and so the new Adam saved the old one, and the condemnation of the flesh was cancelled, through death being put to death by flesh.’

451 1 Cor 15:21.

452 Phil 2:8.

453 Mt 26:39.

454 Heb 5:7–8.

455 Ps 87:5.

456 Col 1:18.

457 2 Cor 5:4.





It was in his entirety that he had sinned and been condemned to death, and therefore it was in his entirety that he begged to be healed by the one who had earlier created our nature and later renewed it. As Gregory the Theologian says:⁴⁵⁸

If it had only been half of Adam that fell, then what was assumed and saved would have been half also, but since it was the entirety, it has been united to the entirety of the one begotten, and the entirety is saved. Let not therefore the advocates of accursed dissent begrudge us our complete salvation, nor clothe the Saviour with only bones and nerves and the appearance of a man. For if the man is without soul, even the Arians assert this, in order to attribute his passion to the Godhead, with the one who moves the body being also the one who suffers. And if he has a soul but not a mind, how is he human? For man is not a mindless animal. And it would necessarily be the case that his form and 'tabernacle' would be human, but his soul would be that of a horse or an ox or some other irrational animal. This, then, will be what is saved; and I have been deceived by the [one who is] Truth, and I who make a proud boast am not the one who has been honoured. But if the man is rational and not mindless (and the one who is endowed by nature with reason is certainly also endowed with will),⁴⁵⁹ let them cease to be really irrational, and let them believe that what is saved is what has been united to God.⁴⁶⁰

Accordingly, together with our nature there has also been assumed and saved by God the Word incarnate the nature's will and operation; and therefore the same was endowed with will and operation according to nature in both of the natures from which and in which he is for our salvation. Let them, therefore, not dissect the prayer of our Saviour⁴⁶¹ in a division of persons, with (as they assert)⁴⁶² God the Word willing the saving passion to be accomplished, but his flesh resisting his will and being in dissension with him. For these are the conceptions of heretical madness, which does not accept that there is the fullness of our nature in Christ God. For the one and the same Lord without confusion or separation made voluntary what is involuntary for our nature, for the reasons that have been convincingly stated by our holy fathers. In addition they again teach us piously that the Lord by his prayer and in his utter goodness made us temperate, lovers

458 Gregory Nazianzen, *ep.* 101.5 to Cledonius, SC 208, 500.

459 This clause in brackets is an interpolation. Gregory makes no reference in this work to Christ's human will.

460 The concluding clause ('and let them believe ...') is also an addition to Gregory's text.

461 Lk 22:42, 'Let not my will but yours be done.'

462 In the *Ekthesis*, p. 229.





of mankind and especially lovers of God, imitating his prayer as far as we are able. [We become] temperate and lovers of mankind by rejecting temptations, being merciful to those who persecute us, and recognising our own weakness according to the injunction of the Lord, who told us to ‘pray not to enter into temptation, for the spirit [364] is eager but the flesh is weak’.⁴⁶³ [We become] lovers of God by yielding to him readily, obeying him with docility and never opposing his merciful plans for us, in order to display our pious confession in his regard.

We have an example of all this in the natural author of life, our Lord and God Jesus Christ, in that he suffered in the flesh willingly for our sake.⁴⁶⁴ Our opponents stand convicted of sinning against him through their doctrines. ‘For the plan of the wicked,’ as the blessed Isaiah says, ‘will plan lawlessness, in its eagerness to destroy the sound words of faith with unjust words, but the pious planned wise things, and this plan endures for ever.’⁴⁶⁵

The holy synod said:⁴⁶⁶

The authors of the innovation – as has accurately been proved to us by everything, since not only have their impious statements been totally refuted by each other, but in addition heretical and profane doctrines agree with them in every respect, while the declarations of the fathers and councils of the catholic church differ from them in every way and are inimical to them – were unable to comprehend (as the prophet says, ‘they have been blinded from seeing with their eyes and understanding in their heart’)⁴⁶⁷ the sound definitions of our pious teachers, which they firmly laid down for the preservation of the orthodox faith.

Therefore we, ‘believing unto righteousness in our heart and professing unto salvation with our mouth’ (in the words of the blessed Paul),⁴⁶⁸ piously and without any innovation, as we received from them, hold the following correct beliefs: in ‘one and the same only-begotten Son our

463 Mt 26:41.

464 The preceding discussion has shown that the passion was voluntary for both Christ’s wills, human as well as divine. This contrasts with the dominant teaching before the seventh century, as in a passage of Cyril of Alexandria quoted above: ‘His dying on behalf of all was voluntary in that the divine nature had so resolved it, but involuntary in respect of ... the deprecation of death by the flesh’ (p. 332, §41).

465 Is 32:7–8, with ‘the sound words of faith’ replacing ‘the humble’.

466 There now follow the canons, of ‘chapters’, of the council, with their introduction, presumably read out by one of the notaries.

467 Is 44:18.

468 Rom 10:10.





Lord and God Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead and the same perfect in manhood, truly God and the same truly man, of a rational soul and body, consubstantial with the Father in respect of the Godhead, and the same consubstantial with us in respect of the manhood, like us in all things apart from sin, begotten from the Father before the ages in respect of the Godhead, and the same in the last days for us and for our salvation from Mary the ever-Virgin and Theotokos in respect of the manhood, one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, acknowledged from two natures and in two natures without fusion, change, division, or separation (the difference of the natures being in no way destroyed by the union, but rather the distinctive character of each nature being constantly preserved and coming together into one person and one hypostasis), not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Only-begotten, God, Word, Lord, Jesus Christ.⁴⁶⁹

And just as [we profess] his natures united without fusion or division to be two, [366] so [we profess] the wills according to nature, divine and human, to be two, and his natural operations, divine and human, to be two, for a total and flawless confirmation that the one and the same our Lord and God Jesus Christ is truly by nature perfect God and perfect man apart from sin alone, and that he wills and operates our salvation both divinely and humanly, 'as from of old the prophets and Jesus Christ himself taught us about him and the creed of our holy fathers has handed down',⁴⁷⁰ and simply all the holy and ecumenical five councils and all the approved teachers of the catholic church.

Now, therefore, that we have professed these things with piety and orthodoxy according to their inspired teaching, in harmony and common accord we all issue the following decree.

[368]⁴⁷¹ Chapter 1. If anyone does not acknowledge in accordance with the holy fathers, properly and truly, Father and Son and Holy Spirit, trinity

469 The final section of the Chalcedonian Definition, with a few changes, notably the addition of 'from two natures'. Cp. Price and Gaddis (2005) II, 204.

470 The next clause in the Chalcedonian Definition, again with minor changes of wording.

471 I keep to the Greek text, which is certainly primary. There are two Latin versions (given in parallel columns in ACO) – the original version in the Latin Acts, and a revision of it found in ninth-century canonical collections; see Riedinger (1980) 52–3. The Greek edition, but not the Latin, adds a heading at this point: 'The decree, in the form of chapters, of the holy and apostolic synod of sacred bishops that assembled in Elder Rome.' This is clearly a late editorial addition made to assist the excerpting of the canons from the sessional proceedings.





in unity and unity in trinity,⁴⁷² that is, one God in three hypostases that are consubstantial and equal in glory, and of the three one and the same Godhead, nature, essence, power, lordship, kingship, authority, will, operation, sovereignty, uncreated, unoriginated, infinite, immutable, creative of the things that exist, providential and sustaining, let him stand condemned.⁴⁷³

Chapter 2. If anyone does not acknowledge in accordance with the holy fathers, properly and truly, God the Word, one of the holy, consubstantial and adorable Trinity, who descended from heaven, was incarnate from the Holy Spirit and the all-holy ever-virgin Mary, and became man, was crucified in the flesh for us and our salvation, willingly suffered and was buried and rose on the third day, and ascended into heaven and is seated at the right hand of the Father, and will come again with his paternal glory,⁴⁷⁴ together with the flesh (with its intellectual soul) that he assumed, to judge the living and the dead, let him stand condemned.⁴⁷⁵

Chapter 3. [370] If anyone does not acknowledge in accordance with the holy fathers, properly and truly, the holy, ever-virgin and immaculate Mary to be Theotokos, as having properly and truly at the end of the ages conceived from the Holy Spirit without seed and borne incorruptibly God the Word, born from God the Father before all ages, while her virginity remained intact even after the birth, let him stand condemned.⁴⁷⁶

Chapter 4. If anyone does not acknowledge in accordance with the holy fathers, properly and truly, the two births of the one and the same our Lord and God Jesus Christ, one before the ages, bodiless and eternal, from God the Father, and the other at the end of the ages and in the flesh from the holy ever-virgin Mary,⁴⁷⁷ and that the one and the same our Lord and God Jesus Christ is consubstantial with God the Father in respect of the Godhead

472 Cp. Justinian, *On the orthodox faith*, 'unity in trinity and trinity in unity' (Price (2009) I, 130).

473 Cp. Justinian, *On the orthodox faith*, Anathema 1 (Price (2009) I, 143) and Constantinople II, Canon 1 (Price (2009) II, 120).

474 That is, with the glory which he shares with the Father.

475 A paraphrase of the Nicene–Constantinopolitan Creed (p. 269 above).

476 Cp. Constantinople II, Canon 6 (Price (2009) II, 121–2) and Cyrus, *Plerophoria*, ch. 5 (ACO² II/2, 596–8).

477 Cp. Constantinople II, Canon 2 (Price (2009) II, 120).





378 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

and consubstantial with the Virgin Mother in respect of the manhood,⁴⁷⁸ and that the same is 'passible in the flesh and impassible in the Godhead, circumscribed in the body and uncircumscribed in the spirit, and that the same is both created and uncreated, earthly and heavenly, visible and intelligible, finite and infinite, so that the complete man who fell under sin should be formed anew by the same who is both complete man and God',⁴⁷⁹ let him stand condemned.

Chapter 5. [372] If anyone does not acknowledge in accordance with the holy fathers, properly and truly, that 'one incarnate nature of God the Word', because of saying 'incarnate', signifies that our essence is completely and perfectly in Christ God, apart from sin alone, let him stand condemned.⁴⁸⁰

Chapter 6. If anyone does not acknowledge in accordance with the holy fathers, properly and truly, that the one and the same our Lord and God Jesus Christ is from two natures, Godhead and manhood, and in two natures, Godhead and manhood, united hypostatically without fusion or division, let him stand condemned.⁴⁸¹

Chapter 7. If anyone does not acknowledge in accordance with the holy fathers, properly and truly, that after the ineffable union the difference in the essence of the natures from which the one and only Christ exists is preserved in him without fusion or division, let him stand condemned.⁴⁸²

Chapter 8. If anyone does not acknowledge in accordance with the holy fathers, properly and truly, that the union according to composition or hypostasis of the natures from which the one and only Christ exists is recognised in him without division or fusion, let him stand condemned.⁴⁸³

478 It was more usual to say that Christ is consubstantial with *us* in respect of the manhood, but cp. Flavian of Constantinople at the Home Synod of 448 (Price and Gaddis (2005) I, 221, §511).

479 Gregory Nazianzen, *ep.* 101.14–15 to Cledonius, SC 208, 42 ('created and uncreated' being an addition).

480 Cp. Constantinople II, Canon 8 (Price (2009) II, 122–3).

481 For this characteristically neo-Chalcedonian combination of 'in two natures' and 'from two natures' see Price (2009) I, 71–2.

482 Cp. in the Chalcedonian Definition 'the difference of the natures being in no way destroyed, but rather the distinctive character of each nature being preserved'.

483 Based, with a shift in stress from the duality to the unity, on the Chalcedonian Definition's 'acknowledged in two natures without fusion, change, division, or separation'.





Chapter 9. **[374]** If anyone does not acknowledge in accordance with the holy fathers, properly and truly, that the natural particularities of the Godhead and manhood of Christ are preserved in him without defect or diminution, for a true confirmation that the same is perfect God and perfect man by nature, let him stand condemned.⁴⁸⁴

Chapter 10. If anyone does not acknowledge in accordance with the holy fathers, properly and truly, that the connaturally⁴⁸⁵ united wills, divine and human, of the one and the same Christ God are two, since the same is endowed for our salvation with will according to nature in each of his natures, let him stand condemned.

Chapter 11. If anyone does not acknowledge in accordance with the holy fathers, properly and truly, that the connaturally united operations,⁴⁸⁶ divine and human, of the one and the same Christ God are two, since the same is endowed with operation for our salvation according to nature in each of his natures, let him stand condemned.

Chapter 12. If anyone acknowledges in accordance with the accursed heretics that the Godhead and manhood of Christ have one nature or one will or one operation, in a rejection of the confession of the holy fathers and a denial of the dispensation of our Saviour, let him stand condemned.⁴⁸⁷

Chapter 13. **[376]** If anyone in accordance with the accursed heretics adds an injunction that together with the two wills and two operations, divine and human, preserved in union in their essences in Christ God and

‘Union according to composition’ comes from Constantinople II, Canon 4, ‘his composite hypostasis is one’.

484 After the neo-Chalcedonian emphasis on the unity in the preceding canons, this restores the dyophysite emphasis of Chalcedon in preparation for the following canons on the duality of will and operation in Christ.

485 συμφυῶς (‘coherenter’ in the Latin), signifying that the two form a continuous whole, without division. The word, as used by Maximus the Confessor, relates to the constitution of Christ’s natures and not simply to their cooperation (Doucet (1985) 147–50). Its use in both this and the following chapter emphasises that Christ’s wills and operations are different in character but never separate.

486 Cp. Maximus, *opusc.* 20, PG 91. 232A: ‘Nothing divine or human is accomplished separately, but they proceed both connaturally and unitedly from one and the same.’

487 By including the phrase ‘one nature’ this chapter insists that monoenergism and monothelism are not genuine varieties of Chalcedonian Christology but monophysite.





piously proclaimed by our holy fathers, there is also to be acknowledged, contrary to their teaching, both one will and one operation, let him stand condemned.⁴⁸⁸

Chapter 14. If anyone in accordance with the accursed heretics, denies and rejects, together with the one will and one operation in Christ God impiously acknowledged by the heretics, also the two wills and two operations, divine and human, preserved in union in their natures in Christ God and proclaimed in him according to orthodoxy by the holy fathers, let him stand condemned.⁴⁸⁹

Chapter 15. If anyone in accordance with the accursed heretics senselessly accepts that the theandric operation is one, and does not acknowledge in accordance with the holy fathers that it is double, that is, divine and human, or takes the expression ‘the new’ when applied to the theandric [operation] to signify one operation, but not to indicate the astounding and supernatural union of both, let him stand condemned.⁴⁹⁰

[378] Chapter 16. If anyone in accordance with the accursed heretics, in denial of the two wills and two operations, divine and human, preserved in union in their essences in Christ God and piously proclaimed by the holy fathers, foolishly imposes dissensions and divisions on the mystery of his dispensation, and therefore attributes in respect of essence the sayings in the gospels and the apostles about the Saviour not to one and the same person, that is, to our Lord and God Jesus Christ, according to the celebrated Cyril,⁴⁹¹ in confirmation that the same is God by nature and truly man, let him stand condemned.⁴⁹²

488 This chapter excludes any irenic proposal that monotheletism and dyotheletism should be tolerated equally.

489 This condemns the *Typos*, with its ban on both monothelete and dyothelete terminology, doubtless on the grounds that heresy and orthodoxy should not be put on a par; see pp. 264–5 above.

490 This condemns the monoenergist interpretation of ‘a new operation, the theandric’ in Ps.-Dionysius, *ep.* 4; see p. 224 above.

491 The reference is Cyril’s doctrine of the single subject of all the biblical statements about Christ, e.g. in the fourth of the Twelve Chapters (Price 2009, II, 47).

492 Cp. the claim made by Maximus of Aquileia above (p. 362) that monotheletism implies dividing Christ. The positive implication of this chapter is that the doctrine of Christ’s unity excludes contrariety of will.





Chapter 17. If anyone does not acknowledge in accordance with the holy fathers, properly and truly, everything that has been handed down and proclaimed to God's holy, catholic and apostolic church by the holy fathers and the approved ecumenical five councils,⁴⁹³ to 'one title'⁴⁹⁴ in expression and meaning, let him stand condemned.⁴⁹⁵

Chapter 18. If anyone in accordance with the holy fathers and in harmony and agreement with us does not reject and anathematise with soul and voice all those who are rejected and anathematised as notorious heretics together with all their writings to one title by [380] God's holy, catholic and apostolic church (which is to say the holy and ecumenical five councils and all the like-minded and approved fathers of the church), namely Sabellius, Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinarius, Polemon, Eutyches, Dioscorus, Timothy Aelurus, Severus, Theodosius, Colluthus, Themistius, Paul of Samosata, Diodore, Theodore, Nestorius, Theodulus the Persian, Origen, Didymus, Evagrius,⁴⁹⁶ and simply all the other heretics censured and rejected by the catholic church, whose doctrines are the products of diabolical operation, and those who held or hold or will hold till death, without repenting, opinions like theirs, and justly together with them those who have been shown by what they taught to share their opinions and tenets and who ended their lives in their error, we mean Theodore who was bishop of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius of Constantinople and his successors Pyrrhus and Paul, who have continued in their heresy, and all their impious writings, and those who held or hold or will hold till death, without repenting, opinions like theirs, that is, one will or one operation of the Godhead and manhood of Christ, and [382] in addition to them [does not reject and anathematise] the most impious *Ekthesis* issued against the orthodox faith by the emperor Heraclius at the prompting of the same Sergius, which lays down the upholding of one will and (through

493 This reading is confirmed by the Latin versions, but it is the uniform practice elsewhere for the epithet 'approved' to qualify 'fathers' and not 'councils'.

494 Mt 5:18.

495 The main contention of Sessions IV and V has been that the doctrine of two operations and wills is the traditional and approved teaching of both fathers and councils.

496 To the names traditional in such lists by the middle of the sixth century are added monoenergists and monotheletes cited above – Polemon, Severus of Antioch, Theodosius of Alexandria, Colluthus, Themistius, and Theodulus the Persian. Of these all save Colluthus and Theodulus had come in the long list of heretics in Sophronius of Jerusalem's *Synodical Letter*.





fabrication) one operation of Christ God,⁴⁹⁷ and all their impious writings and proceedings in its support, and those who accept it or any of the writings and proceedings in its support, and again together with them the most impious *Typos* recently issued against the catholic church by the now serenely reigning emperor Constantine at the instigation of the same Paul, which declares that the two natural wills and operations, divine and human, in Christ true God and our Saviour piously proclaimed by the holy fathers are to be denied and relegated to silence together with the one will and one operation in him impiously advocated by the heretics, and thereby lays down that together with the holy fathers the accursed heretics are to be unjustly acquitted, free of censure and condemnation, for the overthrow of the decrees and canons of the catholic church – so if anyone, as has already been said, does not in harmony with us reject and anathematise all these impious doctrines of their heresy and the impious writings on their behalf or in their defence by anyone at all [384] and also, as enemies of the catholic church, the said heretics themselves, we mean Theodore and Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul, or if anyone holds to be deposed or condemned at all anyone of those who have been recklessly deposed or condemned in whatever way or in whatever place or at whatever time by them or by those holding beliefs like theirs orally or in writing, because he does not share their beliefs but professes with us those of the holy fathers, and does not regard such a person, whoever he may be, that is, whether a bishop or presbyter or deacon or of any other ecclesiastical rank, or a monk or a layman, as pious and orthodox and a champion of the catholic church and securely confirmed in it in the rank to which he was called by the Lord, and does not declare their impious opponents and their lawless judgements or decrees on this matter to be null, void and invalid, or rather profane, accursed and execrable, let him stand condemned.

Chapter 19. If anyone, embracing or holding confessedly the opinions of the accursed heretics, asserts out of rash folly that ‘these are the doctrines of piety that were handed down by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word, which is to say [386] the holy and ecumenical five councils’,⁴⁹⁸ calumniating the holy fathers themselves and the holy ecumenical five councils for the deceit of the more simple-minded and the transmission of their own profane heresy, let him stand condemned.

497 The *Ekthesis* was in fact monothelete but not monoenergist.

498 From the *Ekthesis*, p. 229.





Chapter 20. If anyone in accordance with the accursed heretics, in whatever way or on whatever grounds or at whatever time or in whatever place, lawlessly ‘shifts the landmarks’⁴⁹⁹ set firmly in their place by the holy fathers of the catholic church, which is to say the holy and ecumenical five councils, and shamelessly devises innovations⁵⁰⁰ and expositions of another faith or decrees or laws or definitions or declarations or reports or letters or tracts or signed declarations or false testimonies or synods or texts of proceedings or ordinations that are invalid and not recognised in church law or delegations or unlawful and uncanonical delegates, and simply if he does crookedly and criminally, as a result of diabolical activity, anything else that the impious heretics are wont to do, in opposition to the pious and orthodox teaching of the catholic church, which is to say that of her fathers and councils, for the overthrow of the pure profession of faith in our Lord and God Jesus Christ, and continues unrepentant to commit these impieties till death, let him stand condemned for ever and ever. ‘And all the people shall say, So be it, So be it.’⁵⁰¹

[388] Now that these things have been piously decreed by us, and with every precision according to the commandment of the Lord, and we have cast with apostolic authority the tares and all who create stumbling-blocks, together with their strawy and heretical opinions, into the fire of a canonical verdict, and have safely gathered the grain of the orthodox and unimpeachable faith of us Christians in the Lord into the granary,⁵⁰² that is, into his holy catholic church, by means of the winnowing fork⁵⁰³ of patristic teaching, we chant victorious hymns to her together with the prophet Zephaniah: ‘Rejoice exceedingly, daughter of Sion; proclaim, daughter of Jerusalem! Be glad and exult from your whole heart, daughter of Jerusalem. The Lord has taken away from you the injustices of your opponents; he has redeemed you from the hand of your enemies. The Lord will reign in your midst; you will behold evil no more’⁵⁰⁴ – now that you

499 Deut 19:14.

500 The term ‘innovation’ has been used throughout the Acts as equivalent to ‘heretical’. Ever since the second-century rejection of Gnosticism as alien to the original apostolic preaching novelty was regarded as a sure mark of error, e.g. by Tertullian, *Prescription against Heretics*, 29–31.

501 Ps 105:48.

502 Cp. Mt 13:25–30.

503 Cp. Mt 3:12.

504 Zeph 3:14–15, ‘of your opponents’ being an addition.





have repelled every heretical innovation and confirmed the whole orthodox faith, for the sake of gaining eternal life from Christ the God and Saviour of our souls, to whom with the Father and the Holy Spirit be glory, honour, sovereignty and worship, now and forever and for everlasting ages. Amen.

[390] Signatures of the God-beloved bishops of the holy
synod⁵⁰⁵

(1) [391] Martin by the grace of God bishop of the holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome:

[Latin version] This decree for the confirmation of the orthodox faith and the condemnation of Sergius at one time bishop of Constantinople, Cyrus high-priest of Alexandria, Theodore likewise bishop, Pyrrhus and Paul likewise bishops of Constantinople, together with their heretical writings, I hereby enact and sign.

[Greek version, 390] Enacting the preceding decree together with the holy synod here present for the confirmation of the orthodox faith of the holy fathers and of the ecumenical five councils and for the condemnation of all the heretics anathematised by them and of the whole of their impious heresy, and of those who have now sprung up for the perversion of the faith, namely Theodore who was bishop of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius of Constantinople and his successors Pyrrhus and Paul, and of all the heretical writings, including the impious *Ekthesis* and the impious *Typos*, that they unlawfully issued, I hereby sign it with my own hand.⁵⁰⁶

(2) [391] Maximus bishop of the holy church of Aquileia: This decree for the confirmation of the orthodox faith and the condemnation of Sergius at one time bishop of Constantinople, Cyrus high-priest of Alexandria, Theodore likewise bishop, Pyrrhus and Paul likewise bishops of Constantinople, together with their heretical writings, I hereby enact and sign.

(3) Deusdedit bishop of the holy church of Cagliari: This decree for the confirmation of the orthodox faith and the condemnation of Sergius at one time bishop of Constantinople, Cyrus high-priest of Alexandria, Theodore

505 I follow the Latin version of the list, which is the original, with the numbering given in the MSS. For the location of the sees see pp. 418–27 below.

506 This Greek formula, expanded to include specific mention of the *Ekthesis* and the *Typos*, must be a subsequent editorial improvement. It was used, however, by the bishops who signed ‘after the synod’ (nos 107–9 below).





likewise bishop, Pyrrhus and Paul likewise bishops of Constantinople, together with their heretical writings, I hereby enact and sign.

(4) Maurus bishop of Cesena and Deusdedit, presbyter, both representing Maurus the most holy bishop of the church of Ravenna: This decree for the confirmation of the orthodox faith and the condemnation of Sergius at one time bishop of Constantinople, Cyrus high-priest of Alexandria, Theodore likewise bishop, Pyrrhus and Paul likewise bishops of Constantinople, together with their heretical writings, we hereby enact and sign.

(5) Sergius bishop of the holy church of Tempsa, as above.

(6) Reparatus bishop of the holy church of Manturia, as above.

(7) **[393]** Epiphanius bishop of the holy church of Albanum, as above.

(8) Benedict bishop of the holy church of Ajaccio, as above.

(9) Julian bishop of the holy church of Horta, as above.

(10) Papinius bishop of the holy church of Vibo, as above.

(11) Maximus bishop of the holy church of Pisaurum, as above.

(12) Lucian bishop of the holy church of Leontium, as above.

(13) Viator bishop of the holy church of Ortona, as above.

(14) Bonitus bishop of the holy church of Formiae, as above.

(15) Majorianus bishop of the holy church of Palestrina, as above.

(16) Germanus bishop of the holy church of Numana, as above.

(17) Laurence bishop of the holy church of Perusium, as above.

(18) Carosus bishop of the holy church of Falerii, as above.

(19) Marcianus bishop of the holy church of Mevania, as above.

(20) Barbatus bishop of the holy church of Sutrium, as above.

(21) Calumniosus bishop of the holy church of Halaesa, as above.

(22) Peregrinus bishop of the holy church of Messana, as above.

(23) Romanus bishop of the holy church of Cerillae, as above.

(24) Crescentius bishop of the holy church of Locri, as above.

(25) Felix bishop of the holy church of Agrigentum, as above.

(26) Marcellinus bishop of the holy church of Clusium, as above.

(27) Geminianus bishop of the holy church of Volaterrae, as above.

(28) **[395]** Marinianus bishop of the holy church of Populonia, as above.

(29) Luminosus bishop of the holy church of Tifernum Tiberinum, as above.

(30) Potentinus bishop of the holy church of Velitrae, as above.

(31) Maurus bishop of the holy church of Tuscana, as above.

(32) Martin bishop of the holy church of Gabii, as above.

(33) Adeodatus bishop of the holy church of Spoletum, as above.

(34) John bishop of the holy church of Paestum, as above.





- (35) Gaudiosus bishop of the holy church of Reate, as above.
- (36) Laurence bishop of the holy church of Tauriana, as above.
- (37) John bishop of the holy church of Tropeia, as above.
- (38) Luminosus bishop of the holy church of Salernum, as above.
- (39) Sabbatius bishop of the holy church of Buxentum, as above.
- (40) John bishop of the holy church of Tarentum, as above.
- (41) Rufinus bishop of the holy church of Sipontum, as above.
- (42) Adeodatus bishop of the holy church of Ameria, as above.
- (43) Gaudiosus bishop of the holy church of Capua, as above.
- (44) Bonitus bishop of the holy church of Ferentia, as above.
- (45) Maurus bishop of the holy church of Senegallica, as above.
- (46) Maurosus bishop of the holy church of Ancona, as above.
- (47) Bonus bishop of the holy church of Ficuculae, as above.
- (48) Fortunatus bishop of the holy church of Auximum, as above.
- (49) **[397]** Thomas bishop of the holy church of Lunae, as above.
- (50) Bonitus bishop of the holy church of Ferentum Polymartium, as above.
- (51) Maximus bishop of the holy church of Trecalae, as above.
- (52) Paschalis bishop of the holy church of Blanda [Julia], as above.
- (53) Luminosus bishop of the holy church of the Marsi, as above.
- (54) Gloriosus bishop of the holy church of Camerinum, as above.
- (55) Decoratus bishop of the holy church of Tibur, as above.
- (56) Amabilis bishop of the holy church of Ostia, as above.
- (57) Albinus bishop of the holy church of Portus, as above.
- (58) Palumbus bishop of the holy church of Fundi, as above.
- (59) Theodosius bishop of the holy church of Croton, as above.
- (60) Scholasticus bishop of the holy church of Fanum, as above.
- (61) Helias bishop of the holy church of Lilybaeum, as above.
- (62) Aquilinus bishop of the holy church of Assisium, as above.
- (63) Eusebius bishop of the holy church of Atella, as above.
- (64) Martin bishop of the holy church of Centumcellae, as above.
- (65) Juventinus bishop of the holy church of Stabiae, as above.
- (66) Maurus bishop of the holy church of Senae, as above.
- (67) Laetus bishop of the holy church of Luca, as above.
- (68) Theodore bishop of the holy church of Rosellae, as above.
- (69) **[399]** Andrew bishop of the holy church of Ydruntum, as above.
- (70) Justus bishop of the holy church of Tauromenium, as above.
- (71) Felix bishop of the holy church of Panormus, as above.
- (72) Laurence bishop of the holy church of Tuder, as above.





- (73) John bishop of the holy church of Carinae, as above.
(74) Albinus bishop of the holy church of Signia, as above.
(75) Augustine bishop of the holy church of Squillacium, as above.
(76) John bishop of the holy church of Regium, as above.
(77) Barbatus bishop of the holy church of Cumae, as above.
(78) Felix bishop of the holy church of Terracina, as above.
(79) Oportunus bishop of the holy church of Anagnia, as above.
(80) Firminus bishop of the holy church of Blera, as above.
(81) Jovian bishop of the holy church of Firmum, as above.
(82) Anastasius bishop of the holy church of Narnia, as above.
(83) Theodore bishop of the holy church of Tyndaris, as above.
(84) Sapientius bishop of the holy church of Nomentum, as above.
(85) Maximus bishop of the holy church of Misenum, as above.
(86) Gratosus bishop of the holy church of Nepet, as above.
(87) Leontius bishop of the holy church of Naples, as above.
(88) Paschalis bishop of the holy church of Thermae [Himeriae], as above.
(89) **[401]** Oportunus bishop of the holy church of Pisae, as above.
(90) Donatus bishop of the holy church of Mariana, as above.
(91) Bonosus bishop of the holy church of Aleria, as above.
(92) Peregrinus bishop of the holy church of Lipara, as above.
(93) Boethius bishop of the holy church of [Forum] Corneli, as above.
(94) Valentinus bishop of the holy church of Thurii, as above.
(95) Luminosus bishop of the holy church of Bononia, as above.
(96) Crescentius bishop of the holy church of [Forum] Livii, as above.
(97) Stephen bishop of the holy church of [Forum] Popili, as above.
(98) Callionistus bishop of the holy church of Hatria, as above.
(99) John bishop of the holy church of Vicosabinae, as above.
(100) Potentius bishop of the holy church of Pola, as above.
(101) Leontius bishop of the holy church of Faventia, as above.
(102) Donatus bishop of the holy church of Sassina, as above.
(103) John bishop of the holy church of the Unnogours,⁵⁰⁷ as above.
(104) Stephen bishop of the holy church of Dora, as above.
(105) John bishop of the holy church of Gabopolis, as above,
(106) and Victorinus bishop of the holy church of Uzal, as above.

507 The Unnogours were a nomadic people living north of the Black Sea but also as far west as the Pentapolis of Ravenna. See Jankowiak (2009) 255–7.





[403] Those who signed their approval after the synod

(107) John bishop of the holy church of Milan:⁵⁰⁸ All the synodal decrees by you most holy ones in confirmation of the orthodox faith of the holy fathers and of the universal five councils and for the deposition of all the heretics who were anathematised by them and of the impious heresy both of them and of those who have now sprung up for the destruction of the orthodox faith, namely Theodore at one time bishop of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius of Constantinople and his successors Pyrrhus and Paul, with all their heretical writings, and of the impious *Ekthesis* and the criminal *Typos* which they confirmed, I hereby approve and sign.⁵⁰⁹

(108) Justin bishop of the holy church of Cagliari on the island of Sardinia, as above.⁵¹⁰

(109) Malliodorus bishop of the holy church of Dortona, as above.

508 The bishop of Milan, and also the bishop of Dortona or Dertona (who signs below), were under Lombard rule and unable to attend the synod. Their subsequent subscription was an important indication of support for its work in northern Italy, made possible by Lombard hostility to Constantinople.

509 This Latin text, unlike the earlier subscriptions, is a translation of the Greek.

510 Justin was doubtless the successor of the Bishop Deusdedit of Cagliari, who is listed as attending the council and signed above (no. 3). This and the following name are given in the reverse order in the Greek version.





LETTERS OF POPE MARTIN

INTRODUCTION

In both the Greek and Latin versions of the Acts the protocol of the sessions is followed by an encyclical addressed by the synod to the whole catholic church. In the Latin version this is followed by a letter from Pope Martin to Bishop Amandus of Maastricht, asking him to secure written subscriptions to the synodal decrees. In the Greek manuscript there is given, in place of this letter, a collection of eleven letters from Martin largely to churchmen in the East but also to the Church of Carthage and to the emperor Constans II, communicating the decisions of the synod; of these letters we provide a translation of the letter to the emperor and summaries of the rest.¹

The encyclical letter

The first of these documents is a general letter addressed to the whole church by Pope Martin and the synod. Neither the Acts of Chalcedon nor those of Constantinople II contain a comparable document in which the bishops announce their work to the whole Christian world, for in the case of an imperial council this task fell to the emperor.

Just as in the case of the acts of the sessions, the Greek version of this letter is the original and is to be attributed to the compilers of the Greek Acts: that is, to the Greek monks under the direction of Maximus the Confessor. But in the production of the Latin version there is evidence for the involvement of Roman monks or clergy. This is to be found in the wording of scriptural passages. The letter is packed with citations from the Bible; our annotation below specifies seventy-two of these.² Analysis of the

1 It is to be regretted that Riedinger died before producing his promised edition of these letters for CCSG. The text published in Mansi and Migne contains many errors, some of which I correct without annotation.

2 Riedinger (1994) 47 gives the higher tally of 133 citations, but this includes a mass of





Latin version of these passages reveals that no fewer than fifty-four show knowledge of the Vulgate text; of these the vast majority follow the Vulgate precisely, while the rest display a degree of similarity too great to be accidental. Riedinger attempted to account for this by the supposition that the Greek translators to whom he attributed the Latin Acts consulted Latin biblical manuscripts.³ In a few cases such consultation cannot be doubted: the precision, for example, of the citation of the Vulgate text of Ezekiel 33:2–6 goes beyond what could plausibly be attributed to the memory even of a Roman priest steeped in the Latin Bible. But most of the quotations in this letter are echoes of biblical passages rather than citations introduced as such; much of the letter is a cento of such reminiscences. It is not credible that Greek scribes hunted out every such echo in Latin manuscripts in order to reproduce the exact phraseology of the Vulgate. The natural explanation is that the translators who produced the Latin version of this letter were not Greek immigrants or visitors, as Riedinger supposed, but native Romans, clergy or monks, who over the years had memorised large chunks of the Latin Bible. There cannot be certainty over the exact division of labour, but the evidence points indubitably to collaboration between Greek monks and Roman clergy in the production of this letter and, indeed, of the Acts in general.

The letter summarises the main arguments and decisions contained in the Acts. The heretics condemned at the synod, from Theodore of Pharan to Paul of Constantinople, are named and shamed as the disciples of the condemned heretics of old and resistant to the protests and exhortations of the whole church. The teaching attributed to the *Ekthesis*, denying a human will and operation to Christ, is excoriated, as is that attributed to the *Typos*, denying to him any will and operation, whether human or divine. The letter also describes how the synod carried out its work: it set aside by side ‘the sacred decrees of the holy fathers and of the five ecumenical councils and the doctrines of the faithless heretics’, using tradition as the means to expose heretical innovation. This procedure was modelled on that of the First Session of the First Council of Ephesus, at which all the texts and florilegia presented served the purpose of bringing out the opposition between Nestorius’ teaching and that of the Nicene Creed. No less significant was the stated intention of circulating the Acts of the synod

echoes too brief to enable the analysis attempted here, and are best classified as scriptural phraseology rather than quotations.

³ Riedinger (1994) 56–7, and ACO² I, xxvi.





throughout the church (p. 403); this constituted a claim that they were of ecumenical significance.

How were the recipients of the letter supposed to respond to it? It exhorts them 'to conduct similar proceedings in harmony with us', in order that 'those who accept our message' may attain a heavenly reward (p. 403). The rest of the letter consists of a fervent exhortation that consists, in the main, of a cento of biblical passages. The stress is not on the authority of the Roman synod as quasi-ecumenical, even though in their literary form its published Acts imitate those of the ecumenical councils; it is, rather, on the prophetic character of a synod that could in this way make its own the words of Scripture. The message of the letter is that the decrees of Rome should be formally adopted by all those who can recognise biblically inspired teaching.

The letter to Bishop Amandus

The letter from Pope Martin to Bishop Amandus of Maastricht (in north-east Francia) exists only in Latin, which is certainly the language in which the letter will have been sent. The differences in style, content and tone from the acts of the sessions are likely to strike any reader. Riedinger, however, thought to prove that the letter was composed by the same Greek monks who had produced (in his view) both the Greek and the Latin Acts. His argument depended on the fondness in the letter for periphrastic verbal phrases, where an auxiliary verb plus the infinitive is used where a single verb would have conveyed the same sense, and a set of common vocabulary preferences shared with the Latin Acts. We have argued, however, that Riedinger's contention that the Latin of the Acts betrays non-native writers is faulty, and that the use of the Vulgate text for most of the biblical citations and echoes shows that the translators were native Romans who knew the Latin Bible well.⁴ Neither the style nor the vocabulary patterns shared with the Latin Acts establish, therefore, that the letter to Amandus was written by Greek monks. And a decisive refutation of Riedinger's position has recently been provided by R.M. Pollard, who has analysed the use of prose rhythm in the letter. Characteristic of elegant Latin prose is the occurrence of particular syllabic rhythms at the end of sentences; these we call *clausulae*, and this practice constitutes what is called the *cursor*.

⁴ See above, pp. 62–3.





The Latin Acts, including the encyclical letter, do not exhibit the *cursus*, for they are a translation without literary pretensions. In contrast, Pollard found that 84% of the sentences in the letter to Amandus end with one of the favoured *clausulae*.⁵ This points indubitably to composition by an expert, and native, Latin writer.

Bishop Amandus was an important figure in the Frankish Church, whose missionary work in northern Gaul won him the protection and respect of the kings of Austrasia Dagobert and Sigebert.⁶ He was induced to accept the see of Maastricht probably in 646, where he began a series of visitations around his diocese. His eighth-century *Life* recounts how ‘many priests and Levites, rejecting his preaching, refused to hear him’.⁷ In 649 he wrote to Pope Martin (as we learn from this letter, written in reply) asking for permission to resign his diocese, since his clergy had proved incorrigible. The first half of Martin’s letter is devoted to urging Amandus to remain in his see and to depose all those clergy who had offended against church law. Amandus, however, abandoned his diocese and resumed his missionary travels.⁸ The fact (as we learn from the close of Martin’s letter) that he had asked for saints’ relics from Rome suggests that he was already planning to build new churches in missionary areas.

Martin wrote to Amandus not because he was uniquely influential but because Amandus had written to him and sent a courier to receive Martin’s reply. The opportunity for immediate contact with Francia was not to be missed. The second half of the pope’s letter urges Amandus to secure the convocation of a synod of Frankish bishops to approve the decrees of the Lateran Synod, and to get Sigebert, king of Austrasia in north-east Francia, to send a delegation of bishops to Constantinople ‘to transmit without fail the proceedings of our council together with these our synodal letters to our most clement prince’ (p. 411).⁹ The request is evidence that Martin anticipated that his own direct communications to Constantinople might simply be ignored by the emperor Constans, in the same way that, back in 553, Justinian had refused to receive or acknowledge Pope Vigilius’ *First Constitutum*.¹⁰

5 Pollard (2009) esp. 14–17.

6 See Lesne (1914).

7 *Vita Amandi prima* 18, MGH, Script. Rer. Merov. 5, 442–3.

8 Ibid. 19.

9 The courier was also to take a letter addressed to Sigebert personally. For possible evidence that Martin wrote to other rulers in Francia see p. 411, n. 109 below.

10 Price (2009) II, 72.





Neither Martin's letter nor the monothelete controversy find mention in the early *Life of Amandus*, but this lack is remedied in a supplement by Milo, who was a monk priest in the monastery of St Amand (as it was now called) in the mid-ninth century. He had in his hands the Acts of the Lateran Synod, concluding with the letter to Amandus; it is clear from his account that this was the very manuscript that Amandus had received from Pope Martin. But he shows no knowledge of whether Amandus succeeded in securing the Frankish support that Martin was so anxiously seeking.¹¹ The fact that at this very juncture Amandus chose to abandon his see makes it unlikely that he did so, even if he remained a prominent figure in the Frankish Church.¹²

The letter to the emperor Constans

The Greek Acts lack the letter to Amandus but give eleven other letters of Martin, dating to the immediate aftermath of the synod, which seek to publicise its work. The first and most important of these is that addressed by Martin and the synod to the emperor Constans II. The letter repeats the by now familiar claims of the synod – that the *Ekthesis* denies Christ a complete human nature, that the *Typos* docks even his divine nature of operation and will, and that the synod has now condemned these errors at the request of almost the entire church. Martin writes that he is sending the synodal acts, in both their Latin and Greek versions, and asks the emperor to confirm its decisions, promising that God will reward him with victory over the barbarians.¹³ The official character of this letter, as sent by the whole synod, is indicated by the list of episcopal signatures (abbreviated in our manuscript) with which the letter ends.

Riedinger considered this and all the letters in this group to have been concocted for propaganda purposes by the compilers of the Greek Acts.¹⁴ But, as with the protocol of the sessions, composition in Greek points

11 *Vita Amandi secunda auctore Milone*, MGH, Script. Rer. Merov. 5, 452–6. See p. 452, 8–13 for Milo's description of the manuscript: 'written on papyrus sheets'.

12 See the discussion of this episode and of other evidence of Frankish involvement on pp. 78–80 above.

13 The theme was conventional. Its most notorious use was by Nestorius when, on the occasion of his episcopal consecration at Constantinople, he urged Theodosius II, 'Help me in destroying the heretics, and I shall help you in destroying the Persians' (Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* VII. 29.5).

14 ACO² I, x–xi, xii n. 12. There are no known manuscripts of the Latin translation of these letters that is given in the printed editions, which makes it hard to date: Riedinger





to composition by Greek secretaries but is not evidence of forgery. Just as Martin gave his *imprimatur* to the Acts, so we may presume that he authorised the dispatch of these letters in his name. Riedinger does not mention the Latin subscription that follows the letter to the emperor in our manuscript, in which Martin gives formal approval to the Greek version of the letter.¹⁵ He will certainly have written to the emperor, communicating the decisions of the synod and seeking imperial approval. There is no reason to doubt that the present letter is the one he sent.

The other Greek letters (nos 2–11)

A summary may be offered of the remaining letters of Martin in this dossier.¹⁶

(2) To the Church of Carthage (PL 87. 145–53). Written at a time when the see was vacant, the letter is addressed to whoever will be elected bishop and to all the bishops, clergy and congregations under him. Martin commends them for their loyalty to the teaching of St Augustine (148B) and for the orthodoxy expressed in their synodal letter or letters (149B and 152B).¹⁷ He says he is sending them both the synodal acts and his encyclical letter. He names two monks as the bearers of these documents: ‘Theodore and Leontius, devout monks of the sacred lavra’ (148D); this monastery was situated in Africa and dedicated to St Sabas, doubtless because its members were refugees from Palestine.¹⁸

(3) To Bishop John of Philadelphia (PL 87. 153–64). Martin begins by saying that John had been recommended to him by Stephen of Dora, and proceeds to mandate him to appoint orthodox bishops and clergy in the patriarchates of Jerusalem and Antioch and ‘to convert to the Lord those already deposed’ (157A). Martin expresses concern not only over the spread of ‘heresy’ (by which he must mean acceptance of the *Typos*) but

(1980, 53) thought it could be either ninth-century or ‘humanist’ (that is, early modern). This lack of a contemporary Latin version intensified his doubts as to the letters’ authenticity.

15 The subscription describes the Greek text of the letter as a translation, but this simply continues the fiction (restated in the letter itself) that the Greek version of the Acts was a translation from the Latin (cp. p. 154 above).

16 See also the notes in Winkelmann (2001) 130–4.

17 The reference is to the African letters read out at Session II, or specifically to the letter from the suffragan bishops of Proconsularis (pp. 170–80).

18 See p. 150 above. This Leontius is to be distinguished from the Leontius of the monastery of St Theodosius mentioned in the letter to John of Philadelphia; they will be the two Leontii in the list of monks who presented a petition to the synod (pp. 155–6).





also over the irregular ordinations that resulted from the chaos following the Muslim invasion (160A). Again he says he is sending both the synodal acts and his encyclical letter for John to circulate round the ‘catholic’ (i.e. orthodox) eastern churches. He names as the bearers ‘our presbyter and *apocrisiarius* Abba Theodore’ (the same Theodore mentioned in the preceding letter) and three monks of the Palestinian monastery of Theodosius who had attended the synod (161A). The letter concludes with a mention of other eastern clergy and magnates to whom Martin has written requesting their support for the mission entrusted to John, namely the recipients of several of the letters that follow (to Theodore, Antony, George and Peter).

(4) To Bishop Theodore of Esbus¹⁹ (PL 87. 164–5). Martin compliments him on his battling against heresy, mentions that he has sent the synodal acts to John of Philadelphia and exhorts Theodore to give John his assistance.

(5) To Bishop Antony of Bacatha²⁰ (PL 87. 165–8). Antony had written to Martin admitting that he had been deceived and expressing repentance (i.e. that he had accepted the *Typos* but now acceded to the synod); Martin replies, ‘restoring’ him to his see. He mentions the dispatch of the synodal acts to John of Philadelphia and requests Antony’s assistance in wording identical to the preceding letter.

(6) To George, archimandrite of the monastery of St Theodosius (PL 87. 168). Martin thanks this superior of one of the greatest monasteries of Palestine for providing some monks as an escort for Stephen of Dora. He mentions the dispatch of the synodal acts and requests George’s assistance, again in identical wording.

(7) To Pantaleon, a cleric in Jerusalem (PL 87. 170–4).²¹ Martin rebukes Pantaleon for giving credence to charges brought against Stephen of Dora (Pantaleon must have written to Martin pressing these charges) and defends his policy of appointing new bishops in Palestine, especially to replace bishops appointed in Palestine during the patriarchate of Sophronius but without Sophronius’ permission.

(8) To the illustrious Peter²² (PL 87. 174–5). Martin asks Peter to give his support to John of Philadelphia in his work, as papal legate, of appointing

19 Esbus was in the province of Arabia, and not far from Philadelphia.

20 Bacatha was in Palestine I, just over the border from Arabia.

21 Possibly identical to the ‘Pantoleon’ who was an hegumen in Jerusalem and composed extant homilies; so Winkelmann (2001) 247.

22 The honorific implies senatorial rank (Jones (1964) 528–30). Peter is likely to have been a former high government official, now resident in Palestine or Arabia.





new bishops. The letter stresses pastoral need and makes no mention of heresy.

(9) To the churches of Jerusalem and Antioch (PL 87. 175–9). Martin communicates the substance of the synod's decrees – its dyoenergist and dyothelete definitions and its condemnation of Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul of Constantinople. Those addressed are the bishops, clergy, monks and laity of the patriarchates of Jerusalem and Antioch, since (as the letter states) Martin refused to recognise the two oriental patriarchs at this date loyal to Chalcedon (Macedonius of Antioch and Peter of Alexandria, both probably resident in Constantinople) because of their acceptance of the *Typos*; this he gives as the grounds for his mandating John of Philadelphia, as his representative, to ordain bishops and priests.

(10) To Bishop Paul of Thessalonica (PL 87. 182–91). Martin narrates that he had been assured by Paul's *apocrisarii* that Paul had assented to the *Typos* in his original synodical letter only under constraint and would soon submit to Rome. Martin summoned him to Rome (clearly to take part in the synod), but instead (Martin continues) Paul has written to him refusing to condemn the monotheletes and in effect reaffirming the teaching of the *Typos*; his letter had actually reached Martin on 1 November, precisely at the close of his own synod (187C–190A). Martin responds in this letter by solemnly anathematising Paul and his teaching and deposing him from the episcopacy (190D), at least until Paul himself repudiates his own proceedings and accepts the decrees of the synod. Like the encyclical, this letter contains many biblical citations, as Martin seeks to win for his words of reprobation a quasi-scriptural authority.

(11) To the clergy and laity of the Church of Thessalonica (PL 87. 191–8). Martin informs them that he has deposed their bishop, and urges them to have no dealings with him (198B). He reminds them that Christ himself came to earth to bring not peace but a sword (Mt 10:34).

These letters give evidence of Pope Martin's attempts to promote the dyothelete cause and the decisions of his synod in Africa and the East. The scope for circulating the full documentation was clearly limited: the letters make mention of the dispatch of only one copy of the Acts to the East, namely that destined for John of Philadelphia, the papal representative in Syria-Palestine.²³ The pope's intention was that John, having received the acts, should make their contents 'known to all' (179C).

23 Caspar (1932) 124 is sceptical as to whether even John received his copy.





A startling feature of these letters is the extent of the pope's attempted interference in the eastern churches. The bishop of Thessalonica was technically his vicar or deputy, even though in practice the bishops of Thessalonica had long felt more beholden to Constantinople than to Rome.²⁴ That Martin responded to his vicar's opposition to his policy by attempting to depose him is not therefore surprising. But Martin's instructions to John of Philadelphia to consecrate 'catholic' bishops in Syria and Palestine constituted an attempt to replace the patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem by direct Roman jurisdiction, and would have been perceived in the East as utterly uncanonical. The policy was so startling and so doomed to failure that one might even begin to doubt the authenticity of these letters. But it had been anticipated a few years before by Pope Theodore, who had instructed Stephen of Dora, acting as his representative, to depose monothelete Palestinian bishops.²⁵ And this policy is comprehensible in the chaotic conditions that had resulted from the Arab seizure of Syria and Palestine. Sophronius of Jerusalem (d. 638) had no successor and the patriarch of Antioch, now resident within the safety of the walls of Constantinople, was not in control of his patriarchate; nor was the emperor any longer in a position to influence developments in the Levant. These circumstances render credible an attempt by Rome to impose its own authority on the basis of a dyoenergist–dyothelete doctrine appealing to the legacy of Sophronius. The Palestinian monks who had come to Rome to take part in the synod may well have encouraged Martin to believe that the East was waiting for his lead. But, as these letters reveal (160A, 171BC), Martin was well aware that Sophronius himself had lost control of episcopal consecrations in his own patriarchate, and that John of Philadelphia's predecessor as papal representative, Stephen of Dora, had failed in his attempt to create an anti-monothelete episcopacy in the Jerusalem patriarchate (Letter 7). The best Martin could hope to achieve was the creation of what we may call a 'uniate' church in the East, beholden to Rome rather than to Constantinople or the eastern patriarchates. This would have weakened still further the Christian communities now under Islamic rule, and would have done nothing to improve the standing of the Roman see.

24 Price (2009) II, 298.

25 See Stephen's letter to the Lateran Synod, p. 148 above.



**(1) ENCYCLICAL LETTER²⁶**

[404] Martin, servant of the servants of God, by grace bishop of God's holy, catholic and apostolic church of Rome, together with our most holy synod of the God-beloved priests canonically assembled here with us for the confirmation of the pious doctrines of the catholic church, to those 'who have obtained a faith equal in honour to ours in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ through the washing of regeneration',²⁷ and who dwell in every place under his sovereignty in holiness and righteousness, that is, our spiritual brethren, bishops, presbyters, deacons, superiors of monasteries, ascetical monks, and the whole pious totality of the catholic church.

Grace and peace be multiplied to you in the knowledge and communion of the all-holy Spirit,²⁸ for an inheritance preserved incorruptible and unfading before the beginning of the world, and now revealed to us who believe²⁹ in Christ Jesus our Lord, who 'has granted us everything that contributes to life and piety'³⁰ through the saving proclamation, so that, abiding in this always and coming together in sincere unanimity, 'we may be built up on the foundation of the holy apostles and prophets, with as the cornerstone Christ himself, God over all and the Saviour of our souls, in whom the whole structure, joined together, grows (its growth being through building by the Spirit) into a royal priesthood and holy temple',³¹ so that we, advancing in it from glory to glory, 'may proclaim the virtues of him who has called us out of darkness into his wonderful light',³² 'with whom there is no variation or shadow of change',³³ but the perfection of every blessing. Enlightened by him, we maintain profession in him unshaken, 'until we all attain to the unity of faith and of the knowledge of him, to perfect manhood, to the measure of the stature of his fullness, so that we no longer be children, tossed and whirled about with every wind of

26 I translate the Greek version, which is the primary text (Riedinger (1994) 45–57). The Greek Acts prelude with the letter with the following heading, of later date: 'Encyclical letter in which the holy and apostolic synod urges all Christians everywhere to join it in holding correct opinions and beliefs in our Lord and God Jesus Christ according to the teaching and tradition of the holy fathers and the ecumenical five councils.'

27 2 Pt 1:1, Tit 3:5.

28 2 Pt 1:2, 2 Cor 13:13.

29 1 Pt 1:4, 1 Pt 1:20–1.

30 2 Pt 1:3

31 Eph 2:20–1 with additions.

32 1 Pt 2:9.

33 Jas 1:17.





teaching, by the trickery of men, by the cunning of the deceitful wiles³⁴ of the devil, who always hastens to perform his own works ‘through the sons of disobedience’.³⁵

For we make known to you, beloved brethren, something of which you yourselves possess accurate knowledge, since your own reasoning is devoutly zealous and alert, namely, that, when God’s catholic and apostolic church was at rest and at peace, certain men, ‘like lions roaring and seeking whom to devour’,³⁶ crept in secretly. They long ago were destined to be brought of their own free will to this condemnation for impiety,³⁷ namely Theodore who was bishop of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius [406] of Constantinople, and his successors Pyrrhus and Paul,³⁸ perverting the dispensation of our great God and Saviour into an heretical innovation and ‘denying Christ, the Lord who had redeemed them’,³⁹ through their assertion in writing that in the form of a servant, namely in becoming man for our sake, he did not possess a natural will or operation but was rather (according to them) without essence and without existence – for it would be too little to say without soul, reason or mind – since, as the illustrious fathers of the church teach us, that which is entirely without will and operation is also devoid of all essential existence, which is why they declared that the God of glory our Lord Jesus Christ in each of the natures from which and in which he consists and in each of the natural properties inhering in them is complete in everything apart from sin alone. If he is complete in everything, how can this not apply to a natural will and operation like ours? For it is obvious that a natural property of our essence is its essential operation and will: if these are abolished, the nature itself will be totally abolished along with them, since it will no longer be recognisable through the natural property that characterises its essence. Therefore they handed down to us that we are to hold that his wills and operations are two, equal in number to his hypostatically united natures, that is, uncreated and created, divine and human, cohesively united,⁴⁰ as their statements testify, which, to demonstrate the truth, have been included in the text of our minutes and outshine every beam of the sun.

34 Eph 4:13–14.

35 Eph 2:2.

36 1 Pt 5:8.

37 Cp. Jud 4.

38 For their condemnation cp. the synod’s Chapter 18 (p. 381 above).

39 2 Pt 2:1, with ‘Christ’ as an addition.

40 The phrase ‘cohesively united’ comes from the synod’s Chapters 10 and 11 (p. 379).





While this is what the holy fathers teach us, our said opponents, rejecting and deserting the straight road of the orthodox faith, journeyed on the road of Barlaam the son of Beor:⁴¹ that is, they abandoned themselves to the false faith of the heretics and the self-will of their error, and hardened themselves in the contradiction of their disobedience,⁴² being ‘wandering stars and waterless clouds and fruitless trees in late autumn, twice dead and uprooted, wild waves of the sea foaming out their own shame, for whom has been reserved the gloom of darkness for ever’,⁴³ if they do not repent but shamelessly shoot forth hither and thither the pollution of their heresy, they who ‘exchanged the truth of God for a lie and worshipped’⁴⁴ and preferred to the pious doctrines of the catholic church the deluded writings of the heretics,⁴⁵ in order to endeavour in every way to deceive the more simple-minded or harass those who are more constant in the Lord. This they have already perpetrated against many of the pious men, maltreating them bodily since they have no power spiritually,⁴⁶ having been shattered on the rock of their orthodox faith. For this reason, ‘convulsed’ by their outrageous proceedings and still more outrageous innovations and ‘tormented in the senses of the heart’, according to the divine Jeremiah,⁴⁷ the high priests of blessed memory who preceded us [408] did not cease to conjure and exhort them to abandon this their heresy and to have recourse to sound teaching, ‘lest the Lord be angered and they perish wholly from the path of the righteous’,⁴⁸ namely the pious confession of the holy fathers. This was done with forethought not only by them but also, in their writings, by very many other devout bishops dwelling in various provinces or rather by whole synods, not only exhorting them to correct their heresy, but also entreating and admonishing ourselves, that is, our apostolic see, to rise up canonically and not to tolerate forever the innovation of these opponents, which has been consuming for so many years the catholic churches of God.⁴⁹

41 Cp. 2 Pt 2:15.

42 Cp. Jud 11.

43 Jud 12–13.

44 Rom 1:25.

45 See pp. 362–4 for the attempt to tar the monotheletes with the brush of both miaphysitism and Nestorianism.

46 Cp. Martin’s account in Session I (p. 124) of the persecution of his own representatives and their supporters at Constantinople.

47 Jer 4:19.

48 Ps 2:12.

49 This refers to the letters from the bishops of Africa read out at Session II (pp. 161–86).





Although lovingly exhorted by almost all the priests, they did not incline their ears to heed the voice of those who appealed to them, nor bend the neck of their heart so as to turn to the Lord, but what the Lord says about the disobedient has happened in their case as well; for he says through the prophet, 'I sent out to them all my servants the prophets by day, and in the morning I sent them, and they did not heed me, and their ear did not attend, and they stiffened their neck more than a rock, and they utterly disregarded me, so as to repeat their ways'⁵⁰ and 'to add sins to sins'.⁵¹ For they have endeavoured, in addition to the manhood of the Saviour, to insult and deny his Godhead as well through the impious *Typos*, issued by the most serene emperor at their wicked instigation against the unimpeachable faith of us Christians. In the *Typos* they enact that no one at all is to acknowledge in our Saviour either one or two wills or operations, that is, either a divine or a human will and operation, and that in consequence in each nature and not only in his manhood, according to them, he is wholly without will and without operation, that is, without essence and without existence, in such a way that they reject the orthodox fathers together with the unorthodox heretics, and impose a joint denial not only of the assertions by profane men, namely of one will and operation, but also of the teaching of those who know about God, namely of the two wills and operations of the same Christ. The result is that, while decreeing that the natures are united without fusion or separation, so too, lawlessly, [they enact that] the heretics are to be neither impugned nor condemned for their profession, that is, their advocacy of one will and operation, and that the same freedom and immunity from penalties is to be bestowed on the heretics who were censured for their doctrines as on the holy fathers renowned for their unimpeachable teaching. This overturns the holy canons of the catholic church, or rather the sacred injunction of the whole of inspired scripture, which in no way treats the guilty as innocent nor acquits [410] those liable to condemnation together with the those who are not liable, for this would be irregular and contrary to divine justice. In order to deceive the more simple and conceal their own outrages, our opponents have also added this piece of impudence to the rest – declaring

But, as noted above (pp. 138–9), these letters were written in 646, before Martin's papacy, and provided no direct support for the synod of 649.

50 Jer 7:25–6, 2:36. 'More than a rock' (ὕπερ πέτρων) is taken by Riedinger (1994) 52 to be a mere slip for the normal reading 'more than their fathers' (ὕπερ τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν), but the latter would not fit the present context.

51 Sir 5:5.





in writing and asserting of the invalid doctrines of their impious innovation that ‘these are the doctrines of piety that were handed down to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word and by their successors in sequence, the divinely inspired fathers of the church, and the holy ecumenical five councils’.⁵²

We fitly deemed it fearful and a cause of divine indignation to neglect this assault on the catholic church, lest we be condemned as immature and of having the senses of the soul untrained in the discernment of good and evil.⁵³ Therefore by the grace of God we zealously assembled in this Christ-loving city of Rome to confirm the pious teachings of the church and to confute the impious doctrines of innovation by imitating the holy fathers who preceded us, who in sincere unanimity and a common accord dear to God refuted every heresy and routed all the heretics, freeing the catholic church from their errors, since what results from the sacred concord and spiritual harmony of holy fathers possesses a power against its opponents that is strong and invincible. For, as scripture says, ‘by the mouth of two or three witnesses will every statement be established, and a threefold cord will not easily be broken, and brother aided by brother is like a city secure and lofty, and is as strong as a well-founded palace’.⁵⁴

For this reason, as has already been said, we too, having assembled together in the inseparable communion of the Spirit, have exerted ourselves in the minuted proceedings to set out side by side in clear distinction the sacred decrees of the holy fathers and of the ecumenical five councils and the doctrines of the faithless heretics, both those of old and those who have now sprung up against the faith with their impious *Ekthesis* and the yet more impious *Typos*, in order to demonstrate to all our readers the difference between light and darkness, that is, between patristic truth and heretical error, and that there is no common ground between the heretics and the holy fathers, but that, ‘as far as the East is from the west’,⁵⁵ so far are the impious heretics in word and thought from the men who speak of God. Therefore we have by a decree confirmed the holy fathers together with all their sacred teachings and all those who together with us sincerely accept both the one and the other, and we have anathematised the impious heretics together with all their profane doctrines and the impious *Ekthesis*

⁵² The *Ekthesis*, p. 229. This paragraph repeats the criticisms of the *Typos* made in Session IV (pp. 264–7).

⁵³ Cp. Heb 5:14.

⁵⁴ Mt 18:16, Eccl 4:12, Prov 18:19.

⁵⁵ Ps 102:12.





and the yet more impious *Typos* and [412] all those who heed or defend them or any of the tenets they published or who speak out in defence of them,⁵⁶ so that all of you the pious and orthodox, dwelling throughout the world, when you learn of these our pious proceedings for the protection of the catholic church, may conduct similar proceedings in harmony with us, and confirm all the holy fathers in writing, concurring with them and with us in the orthodox faith, while anathematising all the heretics, both of former and present times, who warred shamelessly against our most holy faith, together with the impious *Ekthesis* and the yet more impious *Typos* and with those who accept them or any of their perverse declarations, so that as the fruit of a pious confession you may attain the salvation of your souls.

It is for this reason that we have sent to everyone everywhere our synodical proceedings in defence of the catholic church, so that, having accomplished the task we set ourselves, we may make known that we are irreproachable before God and the elect angels, in the presence of whom, together with those who accept our message, we shall be judged by him at his dread appearing, and so that we may prove that those who do not heed are without a defence, since they have no excuse for their lack of faith after the manifestation of the truth, for the Lord says, 'If I had not come and spoken to them, they would have no sin, but now they have no excuse for their sin.'⁵⁷ And the apostle said, 'Let us consider each other as an incentive to love and good works, not neglecting the assembling of ourselves together, as is the wont of some, but exhorting to it, and so much the more as we see the day drawing near. For if we sin willingly after receiving the knowledge of the truth, there is left no longer a sacrifice for sins but a fearful expectation of judgement and a fury of fire that will devour the adversaries. For we know the one who said, "Mine is vengeance and I shall repay", says the Lord.'⁵⁸ For this reason, as a warning to us, he enjoins: 'And you, son of man, speak to the sons of your people and you shall say to them, "A land on which a sword would come upon it and the people of the land would take one man from among them and will give him to them as a watchman – [if] he sees the sword coming upon the land and sounds the trumpet and signals to the people, and the one who hears the sound of the trumpet hears and does not take warning and the sword comes

⁵⁶ This summarises the synod's Chapter 18 (pp. 381–2).

⁵⁷ Jn 15:22.

⁵⁸ Heb 10:24–27, 30, citing Deut 32:35.





upon him and takes him, [then] his blood will be upon his head; because when he heard the sound of the trumpet he did not take warning, his blood will be upon him, while this man, because he did take warning, has saved his life. And the watchman, if he sees the sword coming and does not signal with the trumpet, and the people does not take warning, and the sword comes and takes from them a life, it was taken because of lawlessness, and I shall seek the blood at the hand of the watchman.”⁵⁹ ‘Therefore we bear witness to all on this day,’ as the blessed Paul says,⁶⁰ ‘that we are innocent of the blood of you all, for we have not held back from declaring to all’, by means of our present canonical proceedings, the orthodox confession handed down to us by the holy fathers and councils.

[414] ‘Attend therefore to yourselves and to all the flock in which the Holy Spirit has made you bishops, to shepherd the church of God which he acquired through his own blood’,⁶¹ so that there may be no one who seduces or deludes you with persuasiveness of speech through philosophy and vain deceit,⁶² since ‘the Spirit says expressly that in the last times some will apostatise from the faith, cleaving to deceitful spirits and the teaching of demons, with the hypocrisy of the mendacious, cauterised in their conscience’.⁶³ ‘Watch, therefore, and pray that you enter not into temptation’,⁶⁴ which treachery of mind works ‘in those who do not believe in the truth but take pleasure in unrighteousness, because they have not received the love of truth for their salvation’.⁶⁵ ‘For God is not tempted by evils, and he himself tempts no one. Each person is tempted when he is drawn and enticed by his own desire; then desire, when it has conceived, gives birth to sin, and sin when perfected brings forth death. So be not deceived, my beloved brethren’,⁶⁶ ‘carried away by intricate and strange teachings’.⁶⁷ ‘But even if we or an angel from heaven were to preach to you a gospel different from what we received from the holy apostles and the approved fathers and the ecumenical five councils, let him be anathema. As we have said before, we say now again: if anyone preaches to you a gospel

⁵⁹ Ezek 33:2–6.

⁶⁰ Acts 20:26–7.

⁶¹ Acts 20:28.

⁶² Cp. Col 2:4, 8.

⁶³ 1 Tim 4:1–2.

⁶⁴ Mt 26:41.

⁶⁵ 2 Thess 2:12, 10.

⁶⁶ Jas 1:13–16.

⁶⁷ Heb 13:9.





different from what we received from them, let him be anathema. For are we now seeking to persuade men or God? Or are we try to please men? If I was still pleasing to men,' says the blessed Paul, 'I would not be the servant of Christ.'⁶⁸ Therefore as you received Christ from Christ-bearing men, so believe in him, and until the end 'guard the good deposit through the Holy Spirit who dwells in you',⁶⁹ since 'the firm foundation of God stands, having this seal, "The Lord knows his own", and "Let everyone who names the name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness."⁷⁰

Therefore, brethren, 'avoiding profane novelties of speech',⁷¹ in no way accept, as regards the faith, from 'those who speak from the earth'⁷² and 'utter, not from the mouth of the Lord',⁷³ their outrageous decrees or laws or definitions or expositions, knowing that the God of glory is going to seek out and judge all these things, and that no one from among men, 'whose days are as grass',⁷⁴ was crucified for us, neither were we baptised in the name of any of them, but we acknowledge our renewal through the washing of rebirth into the death of Christ God, crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and perceive most clearly that our opponents themselves refute their own doctrines. For the Lord says, [416] 'Every kingdom divided against itself will not stand',⁷⁵ and every definition and law divided against itself will not stand. And even if the *Typos* does not reject the *Ekthesis*, yet the *Ekthesis* rejects the *Typos*, the former saying that the Lord has one will and operation and the latter saying that he has none. So all of them are 'divided' against themselves. How then will the heresy of our opponents 'stand', when it is refuted as worthless and unsound by itself rather than by us? Therefore do not betray your orthodox faith in Christ God for a fleeting shadow and still less for a dissolving corruption, 'honouring persons for the sake of gain'⁷⁶ – since 'like a flower of the grass it will pass away, for the sun rose with scorching heat and dried up the grass, and its flower fell and the beauty of its appearance perished, so too the rich man will wither in his ways'⁷⁷ – lest, if we are addicted to the love of the world, the saying apply to us, 'For

68 Gal 1:8–10 with additions.

69 2 Tim 1:14.

70 2 Tim 2:19.

71 1 Tim 6:20, with καινοφωνίας replacing κενοφωνίας.

72 Is 8:19.

73 Jer 23:16.

74 Ps 102:15.

75 Mt 12:25.

76 Jud 16.

77 Jas 1:10–11.





they loved glory from men rather than glory from the sole God,⁷⁸ and we be subjected to eternal damnation. 'It is fearful,' brethren, 'to fall into the hands of the living God',⁷⁹ who, when he appeared, declared, 'Whoever will deny me and my words before men, I too shall deny him before my Father in heaven.'⁸⁰ 'For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven on all impiety and unrighteousness of men who make war on the truth by unrighteousness and betray it to heresy, for what is known of God is plain to them, for God made it plain to them'⁸¹ through the holy apostles, prophets and teachers and the ecumenical five councils, whose decrees are the law of the catholic church; and nevertheless to all these they have preferred their innovation.

'Let, therefore, no one deceive you with novel words, for because of these things the wrath of God is coming upon the sons of disobedience; therefore do not associate with their doctrines and have no part in their fruitless words, but rather convict them',⁸² since it is 'an assembly of people who deny, and they have bent their tongue like a bow; falsehood and not faith grew strong in them, because they proceeded from evil to evil and knew me not, says the Lord. For they will never speak the truth; their tongue has learnt to utter lies. They committed impiety, and did not cease so as to return, and they refused to know me, says the Lord.'⁸³ Therefore you, beloved, must 'stand by the roads and look, and ask for the eternal paths of the Lord, mark what is the good path of the holy fathers and walk in it, and you will find purification for your souls.'⁸⁴ 'But if you suffer for Christ, blessed are you. Fear them not, and be not troubled, but sanctify the Lord God in your hearts',⁸⁵ and listen to him saying, 'Fear not those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul; fear rather the one who can destroy both soul and body in hell. Are not two sparrows [418] sold for a farthing? And not one of them will fall to the ground without [the leave of] your Father. Even the hairs of your head are all numbered. So fear them not, for you are of more worth than many sparrows.'⁸⁶ 'For consider, brethren, the one who endured from sinners such opposition to himself, lest you faint in

78 Not a biblical citation, but cp. Esther 4:17e (LXX).

79 Heb 10:31.

80 Mt 10:33

81 Rom 1:18–19, the reference to heresy being an addition.

82 Eph 5:6–7, 11, altered.

83 Jer 9:2–3, 5–6.

84 Jer 6:16, with the addition of 'of the holy fathers'.

85 1 Pet 3:14–15, with 'Christ' replacing 'righteousness'.

86 Mt 10:28–31.





your souls and grow weary; for not yet in your struggle against sin have you resisted unto blood.⁸⁷ 'But concerning you, beloved, we are confident of better things, pertaining to salvation',⁸⁸ 'because neither death nor life nor angels nor principalities nor things present nor things to come nor powers nor height nor depth nor any other creation will be able to separate you from the love of our Lord Jesus Christ'⁸⁹ or from orthodox faith in him. Therefore do not cast away your confession, which has a great reward, for we have need of endurance against the assaults of the enemy,⁹⁰ so that, preserving our faith intact to the end, we may receive the promises that the Lord has made to those who strive according to the law. 'For yet a little while, and he who comes will come and not delay.'⁹¹ For 'behold the judge is standing before the doors',⁹² joyfully handing out crowns to those who endure for his sake. But 'if any one draws back,' he says, 'my soul takes no pleasure in him.'⁹³ For he who by drawing back refuses confession in him loses the promise, 'but we are not of those who draw back unto destruction but of those who believe and save their souls'.⁹⁴ 'Therefore take up the panoply of God, so that you may be able on that evil day to withstand every heretical person and doctrine, and put on the breastplate of righteousness, your feet shod with readiness for the gospel of peace, taking up in all circumstances the shield of faith, with which you will be able to quench all the fiery bolts of the evil one, and receive the helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, through every prayer and petition',⁹⁵ 'rooted and grounded',⁹⁶ 'so that you may all say the same with us, and there be among you no schisms dividing the good and perfect body of the church into aberrant innovations, and that you be firmly joined together with the same mind and the same belief',⁹⁷ so that, directing our paths by it, we may without deviating meet the Lord himself in whom we believe, 'coming to him, the living stone, rejected by men' because of their impious heresy, 'but chosen and honoured by God' – or rather, being God

87 Heb 12:3–4.

88 Heb 6:9.

89 Rom 8:38–9.

90 Cp. Heb 10:35–6.

91 Heb 10:37.

92 Jas 5:9.

93 Heb 10:38b.

94 Heb 10:39.

95 Eph 6:13–18, with the addition of 'every heretical person and doctrine'.

96 Eph 3:17.

97 1 Cor 1:10 with additions.





by nature, even though he became flesh for our sake – ‘while you yourselves as living stones are being built up as a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices’⁹⁸ to him in the odour of sweetness.

[420] And now, brethren, we commend you all to the Lord and to the word of his grace, who is able to perfect you and give you an inheritance among all the sanctified. ‘May the God of endurance and consolation grant you to be like-minded with one another’ and always with him and with all, ‘so that unanimously with one mouth and one heart we may glorify him’⁹⁹ in the concord of the orthodox faith, ‘who is able to strengthen you according to his gospel and according to the revelation of the mystery that was kept secret for long ages and has been revealed through the holy scriptures and patristic (or rather, divinely inspired) teachings according to the command of the eternal God for the obedience of faith [and] made known to you all – to the only wise God, our Lord Jesus Christ, with whom to the Father and with the Holy Spirit be glory, honour and power for ever and ever. Amen.’¹⁰⁰

{May God keep you in good health, most beloved brothers.}¹⁰¹

(2) LETTER OF POPE MARTIN TO BISHOP AMANDUS¹⁰²

[422] Martin to his most beloved brother Amandus.

On receiving the letter of your brotherliness, full of zeal for piety, our spirits were lifted up, because, despising the fleeting and transitory delights of this world, you are determined to seek those things which, as everlasting and heavenly gifts, are granted to obedience by the Lord our God. From the account given by the bearer, which fits the tenor of the letter of your brotherliness, we learnt of the struggle of your present labours, for which, in an ascent to the heavenly fatherland with humbled mind and wasted body, a reward of future joy should be bestowed on you. For since the recompense assigned by our Creator to good service wholly exceeds all

98 1 Pet 2:4–5.

99 Rom 15:5–6 with additions.

100 Rom 16:25–7 with additions.

101 This final greeting comes only in the Latin Acts.

102 The Latin MSS provide the heading: ‘The letter of the blessed Pope Martin addressed to the blessed Bishop Amandus, that he should not resign his episcopate, and concerning the heresy that asserts the presence in Christ of one will and one operation in his two natures, divine and human.’





comparison, while the labours we endure out of love for him come to an end after a brief and short period of time, we ought with a ready spirit to bear the trials of this present life through reflecting on the consolation to come. But just as the activity of your labours causes us a great abundance of joy, so too we are worn down by the stubbornness of the priests of that nation, because, neglecting the aids to their salvation and disdaining the service of our Redeemer, they are weighed down by the foulness of their vices. To make salvation available to them, it is incumbent on us at times to lean upon them with importunate exhortation, since the assignment of talents entrusted to us brings about for us a multiplication by two when the trading is completed and the declaration by the Lord's voice calls on us to receive his rest.¹⁰³ For we have been informed that, because there are presbyters or deacons and others in priestly office who are sullied by a lapse after their ordination, your brotherliness is afflicted thereby with intense grief and wishes because of their disobedience to lay down your pastoral duties, to take relief from the labours of episcopacy, and to lead a life of silence and repose, rather than to persevere in what has been entrusted to you, and this despite the saying of the Lord, 'Blessed is he who perseveres to the end.'¹⁰⁴ For what is the source of this blessed perseverance if not the virtue of patience, because (according to the apostolic preaching) 'all who wish to live piously in Christ suffer persecutions'?¹⁰⁵ Therefore, beloved brother, let not the bitterness of afflictions [423] drive you to abandon your mind's pious intent, as you reflect how much our Creator and Lord endured for our forgiveness and liberation, or what insults he gave himself over to suffer, in order to free us from the bonds of the devil's power.

In consequence, to those who have committed sin of this kind you should in no way show lenience, annulling the canons. For he who has once after his ordination lapsed and fallen will from then be deposed and unable to receive any rank in the priesthood; he is to be content with persevering in the same state of penance as long as he lives, with continual weeping and tears, in order by divine grace to wipe out the offence committed. For if for promotion to sacred orders we seek out those who are free from the impediment of some stain or pollution of life, how much more, if after ordination someone has lapsed and fallen and is found guilty of the sin of a violation of duty, is he to be totally prohibited from handling the mystery of

103 Cp. Mt 25:15–28, esp. 16, 'He who had received the five talents went and traded with them, and gained five more.'

104 Cp. Mt 10:22.

105 2 Tim 3:12.





our salvation with befouled and sullied hands. According to the decrees of the sacred canons, a man of this kind is to be deposed for life, so that at the dread judgement he may receive reconciliation from the one who examines the secrets of the mind and rejoices over none of the sheep that go astray,¹⁰⁶ when he observes the sincerity of his penance. Therefore we again exhort your charity, by the example of him who willed to suffer and die for us, to remain ready to serve him in every way; let temporal scourges not make us weary of labouring for the name of Christ, but may the benefits of a future recompense induce us to bear the afflictions of this age. For it is written, 'What can I repay the Lord for all he has paid to me? I shall receive the cup of salvation and call on the Lord's name.'¹⁰⁷ For there is required of us whatever obedient service we are able to render.

Now that everything that we could provide to give strength to the spirits of your brotherliness has indubitably been made known to you through the generosity of the mercy of the Majesty on high, it remains that we should instruct your brotherliness about the other matters that comforted us in your letter. For we believe that it has reached your ears how fifteen years ago, more or less, Sergius the false bishop of Constantinople, with the help of the then emperor Heraclius, upsetting the orthodox faith and trampling upon the catholic church, disseminated an execrable and abominable heresy that renewed the error of the Apollinarians and Severans, Eutycheans and Manichees, and which his successor Pyrrhus, [now] an ex-bishop, who usurped the see of Constantinople in the pride of ambition, made even worse. For this reason the apostolic see repeatedly admonished them, with numerous exhortations, entreaties and rebukes, to renounce this error and return to the light of piety from which they had fallen away. Not only did they totally refuse to do so, but in addition his successor Paul, a violator of the faith and ex-bishop of Constantinople,¹⁰⁸ has now thought up another and even more wicked attempt to prejudice the catholic faith, on the pretence of annulling the heretical teaching of his predecessors, and [424] induced our most clement prince to issue with sacrilegious audacity an imperial *Typos* full of total infidelity, which lays down what all Christian congregations are obliged to believe. We therefore judged it necessary, lest we be saddled with culpable guilt for a neglect damaging to the souls entrusted to us, to convene in this city of Rome a general assembly of our brothers and fellow

106 Cp. Rev 2:23, Mt 18:12.

107 Ps 115:12–13.

108 Note how Paul is no longer recognised by Martin as bishop of Constantinople.





bishops. In their presence the criminal writings of the said heretics were examined and laid bare, and by the apostolic sword and the decrees of the fathers we condemned them with one voice and one mind, so that everyone, through learning of the error contained in them, would wholly escape the stain of their pollution.

We have therefore taken steps that together with our encyclical the volumes of the synodal acts should at once be dispatched to you, from the sequence of which you will be able to learn everything in detail and, like sons of the light, to join us in extinguishing their darkness. May your brotherliness exert yourself accordingly to make the same known to all, so that they may join us in execrating this abominable heresy and at the same time be fully informed of the mystery of their salvation. Let a synodal meeting be held of all our brothers and fellow bishops in those regions, and in accordance with the tenor of the encyclical that we have sent may they publish a written declaration, to be sent to us together with your signatures, confirming and approving the decree we have issued on behalf of the orthodox faith and for the destruction of the heretical insanity that lately sprung up. [May you also exert yourself] to exhort and beseech most advisedly our most excellent son Sigebert, king of the Franks, for the benefit of his own Christianity, to send to us (from the body of our brothers) most beloved bishops, who, if the divine mercy allow it, may act as delegates of the apostolic see and transmit without fail the proceedings of our council together with these our synodal letters to our most clement prince, so that, as an associate in our labours, he may gain a great reward and find to be the protector of his reign the One whose cause is on trial. For this is what we urge on him also in the letter addressed to him.¹⁰⁹

We have given instructions for the gift of relics of the saints, about which the bearer of the present letter spoke to us. For the codices are now exhausted in our library, and we have no supply from which to provide him; he was not able to transcribe the text, since he hastened to depart from this city in a hurry.¹¹⁰

109 Cp. *Vita Eligii* I. 33: 'At this council [Lateran 649] he [Martin] issued a creed against the heretics, gloriously and precisely, which together with an attached letter he sent to the provinces of Gaul, charging and beseeching the king of the Franks, if there were in his kingdom learned catholic men, to have them sent to assist him in suppressing heresy. Eligius with his companion would readily have gone there, had there not been some impediment.' The chronology is problematic, since the *Life* places this episode before Eligius' episcopate, which started in 641; but current scholarship is ready to credit the story. See p. 80 above.

110 The reference is to some manuscript that Amandus had asked for, not to that of the





When, therefore, you have digested what we have written in this letter, we urge your brotherliness to put it into effect.

May God keep you in good health, most beloved brother.

(3) LETTER OF POPE MARTIN AND THE SYNOD TO CONSTANS II¹¹¹

[137] To the most pious and serene master and triumphant victor, [our] son who loves God and our Lord Jesus Christ, Constantine¹¹² Augustus, from Bishop Martin, servant of the servants of God, and the whole synod assembled in this city of Rome.

[140] To the heavenly king of the ages, Christ God, who appeared on earth through flesh that was rationally ensouled and united to him hypostatically, the Magi brought with zeal gifts from earth, which were not so much worthy of his divine glory (for he is beyond compare) as expressive of their zeal; for the former is infinite, while the latter indicates an exceptional love of God. And to you, most serene one, who rule on earth through him and press towards him through your virtues, all of us, being his priests by grace, bring with great confidence precious gifts that come from heaven and lead those who receive them up to heaven, namely the saving doctrines of the holy fathers and councils, as a true demonstration of a deep-seated love of our Lord and God and of you his genuine servant (since ‘every good donation and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of lights’)¹¹³ – you who have attained, as shining gold, a firm and most sincere confession in him, a knowledge of God that is pure, transcendent and fragrant frankincense, and a doctrine that is a myrrh that preserves what is good and expels what is contrary. This, firmly preserved by your authority, will be a crown of beauty and a diadem of glory in the hand of the Lord. For recognition of the truth is an adornment of imperial rule, radiant and imperishable, and found by those who seek it, because it seeks out and surrounds the worthy and is revealed to those who do not put it to the test. For which reason, in this our humble report we

synodal acts, which did indeed reach Amandus, as we know from the *Life* written by Milo, MGH, SRM 5, 452.

¹¹¹ PL 87. 137–46 (= Mansi X, 789–98).

¹¹² ‘Constantine’ was the official name, used in his documents and coinage, of the emperor known popularly as Constans.

¹¹³ Jas 1:17.





have hastened to proclaim his salvation to you, most mighty of emperors, since you seek the Lord in simplicity of heart and are eager to believe the teaching about him in goodness of understanding. For he commands us to proclaim the teaching about him, when he says through Amos the prophet, ‘Hearken, you priests, and bear witness to the house of Israel, says the Lord God Almighty.’¹¹⁴

We therefore inform your pious and serene authority that, assembling together in this your Christ-loving and God-serving city of Rome, all of us, suppliants of your clemency, out of an apostolic and spiritual agreement and unanimity, with the same mind and the same conviction, have confirmed synodically the pious definition of the orthodox faith, and fitly annulled the discordant teaching of the heretics, both past and present, who in the perversity of their reasoning separated themselves from the truth. Reasoning erroneously among themselves, they asserted that the Lord who became man for our sake had neither natural will nor operation in the nature of his manhood, and that he was without either will or operation, and without mind or soul – and this even though, together with the teaching of the fathers, they have their own nature as a witness to the truth, to refute the nonsense they have defined on the matter, since they can see that their own essence, brought into being by their Creator, possesses will and operation. How, then, could he have diminished in respect of natural will and operation the essence so fashioned by himself and adopted in his own incarnation, by not truly confirming our essence in himself but creating an illusory and deceptive appearance of the economy,¹¹⁵ according to those people who have defined on this account that his Godhead and manhood have but one will and operation.

[141] In addition, even though charitably urged and admonished to renounce this their harmful innovation by almost all the God-beloved bishops residing in other provinces and the apostolic high priests enthroned in this city of Elder Rome, they did not submit to correction but progressed to something even worse, annihilating together with his human will and operation the divine ones as well, declaring that he had absolutely no will and operation in either of the natures of which and in which he is, but is by nature without either will or operation – something that overturns the definitions of all the holy fathers and all the five ecumenical councils,

¹¹⁴ Amos 3:12–13.

¹¹⁵ It is significant that this unusual phrase (φαντάσας τὴν οἰκονομίαν) occurs in at least two passages of Maximus the Confessor, PG 91. 93C and 1320C.





which taught that the same is perfect in all respects in Godhead and perfect in manhood, apart from sin alone; for sin does not manifest the perfection of nature but makes known the passionate character of our transgression. And if he was perfect in all respects, it is clear that he was perfect as regards both the divine will and operation (as also the nature), unoriginate and uncreated, and the human will and operation (as also the nature), originated and created. For the one who diminishes him in any respect patently rejects the doctrine of his perfection, totally preventing it from being perceived, through the lack of what belongs to it by nature.

Our opponents – we mean Theodore who was bishop of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius of the imperial city, and his successors Pyrrhus and Paul – not only brought about this deficiency, in both the first and the second¹¹⁶ exposition of their doctrines, but also contrived, against the faith, to ratify the first by means of the *Ekthesis* and confirm the second by means of the *Typos*. They lawlessly seduced the ears of your serenity, as also those of your serenity's grandfather of blessed memory,¹¹⁷ so that they might criminally inflict their own guilt on others, and in consequence 'receive their sins double from the hand of the Lord',¹¹⁸ that is to say, just retribution as lawbreakers for the sins that have for so many years filled the whole earth with no slight tumult. For not only have the pious congregations been scandalised, but the godless barbarians are now mocking the great mystery of our confession, as a result not only of our opponents' rejection of the original and utterly valid faith, but also by their hasty rescinding of their own concocted faith through the introduction in its place of a yet more novel and utterly evil heresy, with the result that even they no longer know what they hold or believe, in consequence of the continuous alteration of their own doctrines.¹¹⁹

For this reason the apostolic see rightly received protests against them from almost all the pious priests and congregations, who besought and adjured it not to let them endanger the catholic church in this way forever, but to rise up with zeal and, by a precise defence of the definitions of the

116 'The first' is their denial of a human will and operation in Christ, and 'the second' is their denial of any will and operation in Christ.

117 The emperor Heraclius.

118 Is 40:2.

119 See above pp. 242–4 for an examination of the charge of utter inconsistency made against the monothelites. Cp. the complaint of the Syrian bishops at Chalcedon in the late summer of 431 at the height of the Nestorian controversy that the dissension over Christian teaching discredited the faith among non-believers in Persia (ACO I. 1/7, p. 73, 28–34).





fathers and councils, rescue the unimpeachable faith of us Christians.¹²⁰ It proceeded to a hierarchical convocation¹²¹ of all of us, so that we should treat and judge canonically, by means of minuted proceedings, all the doctrines of our opponents – of which they have even the effrontery to assert, for the deception of the more simple-minded, that ‘these are the doctrines of piety that were handed down by those who from the beginning were the eyewitnesses and ministers of the word and by their disciples and successors, the inspired teachers of the catholic church in sequence, [144] which is to say the holy and ecumenical five councils’.¹²² Therefore, to demonstrate the truth and expose the false accusations of our opponents, we have clearly set out (one against the other) their perverse doctrines on the one hand and the pious teaching of the holy fathers and councils on the other,¹²³ and finding no similarity between the former and the latter, just as there is no similarity at all between darkness and the light, we have (as we have said) confirmed by decree the one, namely the saving ordinances of the holy fathers and councils, and we have all unanimously condemned the other, as being opposed and hostile to the definitions of piety. [We have also condemned] the heretics themselves, namely the aforesaid men together with their expositions – the *Ekthesis* generated by their teaching, the said *Typos*, and all the proceedings in their support that they have composed –¹²⁴ in order to protect your [faith], which is immaculate in all respects but slandered by our opponents in writing. For they have had the effrontery as regards it to assert in a letter to the devout bishops of Africa that, spurred by a truly imperial intention and plan, you issued the said impious *Typos*, enjoining as harmless a slight concession as regards excessive precision.¹²⁵ This they have written, in no way heeding the conviction of the holy fathers that in the teaching about God and the divine that which falls slightly short is no slight matter. Yet they have been eager, in this matter above all, to inflict their own disgrace (as we have said) on your authority, by testifying, and indicating in writing to others, that the *Typos* offends against precision.

120 This states the claim based on the documentation presented in Session II.

121 Meaning a convocation of bishops.

122 From the *Ekthesis*, p. 229.

123 This summarises Sessions III and IV.

124 This summarises the work of Session V.

125 This suggests a letter from Patriarch Paul of Constantinople to the bishops of Africa Proconsularis, explaining the *Typos*, and spurred by their letter to him of 646 (pp. 170–80).





While rejecting their wickedness and deceit in this regard,¹²⁶ we have in addition condemned their heresy canonically, and have declared to everyone everywhere and above all to your divinely established serenity, by means of our present synodical proceedings in defence of the orthodox faith, that those who know about God teach that the natures, or essences, of one and the same Christ God are to be professed to be two, hypostatically united without fusion or separation, that the natural wills are two, and that the natural operations are two, divine and human, uncreated and created, cohesively united,¹²⁷ in true confirmation of the fact that the same is properly perfect God by nature and perfect man by nature, and one Christ and Son. However, in an attempt to counterbalance the holy fathers, all the heretics, both those who have been corrupted by fusion and those who have been corrupted by separation in their doctrine, have impiously professed one will and one operation in him, in order (some through empty illusion and others through mere equivocation) to annul in their recklessness the great mystery of Christ's incarnation.¹²⁸

In order, therefore, to show clearly to your authority the difference between the two – that is, the fathers of piety and their definitions, and the impious men and their doctrines – we, the suppliants of your piety, have sent our synodical proceedings, together with their translation into the Greek language, beseeching and exhorting your serenity, wise in the things of God, to deign to give them a fitting reading, and to condemn by laws of piety the said heretics together with their heresy, while joining our insignificant selves in confirming by words of piety nothing but the orthodox confession of the holy fathers and councils, for the maintenance of the catholic church and the protection of your Christ-loving and God-serving state, [145] since it is always the case that the preservation of the state goes together with the flourishing of the orthodox faith. For when your serenity has a correct faith in the Lord, who arms his creation to ward off the enemy, he will deservedly give aid to your authority in conquering your enemies. For he will gird your pious authority with the breastplate of righteousness and place on you as a helmet judgement with integrity, and he will bestow holiness as an invincible shield,¹²⁹ so as to subject under your feet all the barbarian tribes that choose war. He will make you victorious by noble

126 The Greek text of the preceding phrase is incomplete (lacking 'wickedness and deceit'), and I follow the Latin, which may reflect a superior Greek reading.

127 Cp. Chapters 10 and 11 issued by the synod (p. 379).

128 Cp. the heretical florilegia read at Session V (pp. 348–57).

129 Cp. Eph 6:14–17.





deeds of valour against both the passions and savage men, and [bestow on you] as a reward for sacred labours an everlasting fruition and repose together with the saints who from of old have received this as their portion. May grace from above protect the most pious rule of our master, and make subject to you the necks of all the nations.

Maximus bishop of the holy church of God at Aquileia: I hereby sign the present report that we have composed.

Deusdedit bishop of Cagliari, likewise.

Maurus, the sinful and unworthy bishop of the holy church at Cesena, representing Maurus the holy bishop of the holy church at Ravenna: I hereby sign the present report that we have composed.

Deusdedit, presbyter, representing Maurus the most holy bishop of the holy church at Ravenna: I hereby sign the present report that we have composed.

And the other bishops of the synod, likewise.

{I, Martin, bishop of the holy catholic and apostolic church of the city of Rome, hereby sign this translation of the report made by us and our council.}¹³⁰

130 According to Caspar (1932) 75, this Latin subscription (lacking in Mansi and PL) concludes the text of the letter in Cod. Vat. Gr. 1455, our one Greek manuscript. He suggests that it applied to the complete text of the acts, which indeed accompanied the letter (as it tells us), but the word 'report' (*suggestio*) would refer more naturally to the account given in the letter (the same word was used for the report sent by Roman Synod of 680 to Constantine IV, ACO² II/1, p. 123, 8).





APPENDIX: THE ATTENDANCE AND SUBSCRIPTION LISTS

Each of the five sessions of the synod is prefixed in the Latin Acts by an attendance list, while the Greek Acts give an attendance list only for Session I. These lists are identical to each other, in the order as well as the identity of the names, and identical to the list of signatories to the synodal canons appended to the proceedings of Session V.¹ The natural presumption is that the attendance list was simply taken from the subscription list. This means that, strictly speaking, we cannot exclude the possibility that some bishops arrived late and signed the subscription list without having attended all the sessions. We can still count them all as having attended the synod.²

The names of the sees represented at the synod may be set out as follows, according to region and city, moving north to south down mainland Italy, then the Italian islands and finally the three bishops from outside Italy.³

VENETIA Aquileia

ISTRIA Pola

AEMILIA Bononia

FLAMINIA Cesena
 Faventia
 Ficulae

1 The one exception is the omission of Stephen of Dora from the attendance list of the first two sessions, because he joined the synod in the course of the second session.

2 It is significant that the names of three extra bishops are appended to the subscription list under the heading 'those who signed their approval after the synod' (p. 388). This implies that all the other bishops who signed attended the synod.

3 I omit the bishop of Unnogours, whose location is unknown but could have been in N.E. Italy.





THE ATTENDANCE AND SUBSCRIPTION LISTS

419

Forum Cornelii
Forum Livii
Forum Popilii
Ravenna

PICENUM Ancona
 Auximum
 Fanum
 Firmum
 Numana
 Pisaurum
 Sassina
 Senegallica

UMBRIA Ameria
 Assisium
 Camerinum
 Mevania
 Narnia
 Spoletum
 Tifernum Tiberinum
 Tuder

TUSCIA Blera
 Centumcellae
 Clusium
 Falerii
 Ferentia
 Ferentum Polymartium
 Horta
 Luca
 Lunae
 Manturia
 Nepet
 Ostia
 Perusium
 Pisae
 Populonia
 Portus





420 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

Rome
Rosellae
Senae
Sutrium
Tuscanae
Volaterrae

VALERIA The Marsi
Reate
Vicosabinae

CAMPANIA Albanum
Anagnina
Atella
Capua
Cumae
Formiae
Fundi
Gabii
Misenum
Naples
Nomentum
Palestrina
Salernum
Signia
Stabiae
Terracina
Tibur
Velitrae

SAMNIUM Hatria
Ortona

APULIA Sipontum

LUCANIA Blanda Julia
Buxentum
Paestum





THE ATTENDANCE AND SUBSCRIPTION LISTS

421

CALABRIA Tarentum
Ydruntum

BRUTTII Cerillae
Croton
Locri
Regium
Squillacium
Tauriana
Tempsa
Thurii
Tropeia
Vibo

CORSICA Ajaccio
Aleria
Mariana

SARDINIA Cagliari

SICILY Agrigentum
Carinae
Halaesa
Leontium
Lilybaeum
Lipara
Messana
Panormus
Tauromenium
Thermae Himeriae
Trecalae
Tyndaris

AFRICA Uzalis

PALESTINE Dora
Gabopolis





The overwhelmingly Italian character of the synod requires explanation. Did Popes Theodore and Martin seek a wider attendance? Paul of Thessalonica, the papal vicar in Illyricum, was summoned, but failed to attend.⁴ But if bishops had been summoned from Africa, more than one would have responded, and the presence of the bishop of Uzalis (in Proconsularis) must have been accidental. Stephen of Dora came from Palestine as papal vicar; of John of Gabopolis (or Gabe) in Palestine II nothing is known, but he is likely to have been a refugee staying in Rome.

The attendance from Italy is remarkably irregular, being minimal from both the north of the country and the south-east. In the latter case we must remember the comparative sparsity of cities in that region and problems of travel (sea journeys were preferred to land ones). In the north the 'Istrian Schism' caused by rejection of Rome's acceptance of the condemnation of the Three Chapters at the Second Council of Constantinople (553) still divided bishops in the region;⁵ the way in which after the synod the bishop of Milan added his name to the signatories to its decrees (p. 388 above) is notable in this context. But the obvious explanation of the irregularities is the Lombard control of much of Italy. This is not to suggest that the Lombards systematically prevented attendance, or that bishops in Lombard-controlled regions were uniformly afraid to leave their flocks unprotected, for the representation from the Lombard duchy of Spoletum is considerable, including the sees of Spoletum, Assisium, Reate, the Marsi, Camerinum and Ortona. But it is possible that the Lombard duchy of Beneventum (in the south-east) was less sympathetic to catholic bishops. That the Lombards were so well informed about the purposes of the synod as to have had a view about the desirability of a Roman synod that was anti-Byzantine is unlikely and, if they had, they could equally have supported it for political reasons or opposed it as needlessly provocative. We are not well informed about the geographical extent of Lombard control or about relations between the Lombards and the native population at this time, but it is a reasonable surmise that the regions well represented at the synod were precisely those under continuing imperial (or papal) control.⁶

4 See p. 396 above.

5 See Markus (1997) 125–40.

6 This question is treated in more detail on pp. 69–71 above.





MAPS







MAPS

425







MAPS

427





GLOSSARY

Agnoetes A miaphysite group in the sixth century who denied omniscience to Christ's human mind, in view of his 'self-emptying' (Phil 2:7).

apocrisiarius The representative of a bishop, in particular the permanent representative of the pope or a patriarch or metropolitan at Constantinople.

Apollinarian(ism) The heresy, associated with the Apollinarius of Laodicea (d. c.390), which taught that in Christ the divine Word took the place of a rational human soul.

apostolic see The see of Rome, as founded by Sts Peter and Paul.

Arianism The doctrine of Arius, condemned at the Council of Nicaea (325) for denying the true divinity of Christ. In the context of the monothelete dispute the reference is generally to Arius' supposed denial of a human rational soul and will to Christ.

cartularius A junior official in a government office.

catholicos The title of the head of several of the eastern churches, including the Nestorian (or Church of the East) and the Armenian.

Chalcedonian Definition The chief work of the Council of Chalcedon (451) was the production of a 'definition' (pp. 271–3 above) approving various documents (including some letters of Cyril of Alexandria and the Tome of Pope Leo) and defining that Christ is one person and hypostasis (q.v.) in two natures.

chapter Generally a short statement or citation or article or anathema.

clausula A rhythmic figure (of which there were several) which was preferred in elegant Latin prose to conclude a sentence or clause.

council See 'synod'.

deacon The third clerical rank, after bishop and presbyter (q.v.). Though their liturgical functions were restricted, deacons could serve as the principal assistants of their bishops (sometimes called 'archdeacons').

dispensation This translates *dispensatio* or οἰκονομία ('economy'), meaning the dispensation (or divine plan) of salvation, concretely the Incarnation of the Son.

docetism The heresy that attributes to Christ only the semblance of a human nature.

dyophysite 'Two-nature', of the Christology, formally adopted at the Council of Chalcedon, that ascribes two natures (Godhead and manhood) to Christ.

dyoenergist/dyoenergism The assertion of 'two operations' in Christ: that is, both divine and human, corresponding to his two natures.





dyothelete/dyothelitism The assertion of ‘two wills’ in Christ, both divine and human, corresponding to his two natures.

economy The English equivalent of οἰκονομία, in the sense of ‘accommodation’ or leniency in matters of doctrine (or church discipline). The opposite of ἀκρίβεια (‘precision’), it meant the use of imprecise doctrinal expressions for the sake of church unity, where precise ones would be misunderstood and cause division. In relation to canon law, it meant the waiving of the letter of the law in view of pastoral or compassionate needs.

ecumenical When used of a council the term meant empire-wide, or general, as contrasted to local. Imperial convocation was considered necessary, and a council that was not attended by representatives of the pope and the eastern patriarchs could not count as ecumenical. Maximus the Confessor’s description of the synod of 649 as ‘ecumenical’ was therefore an extension of the meaning of the term – to synods that were ecumenical not canonically but in their significance.

Ekthesis A document (pp. 226–30 above) composed by Sergius of Constantinople and issued by the emperor Heraclius in the aftermath of the Council of Cyprus of 636 (see pp. 10–11 above). It forbade further debate over the number of operations in Christ and referred to the oneness of his will.

Eutychanism The heresy attributed (unfairly) to the Constantinopolitan archimandrite Eutyches and condemned at the Council of Chalcedon (451), which denied that Christ was consubstantial with us in his manhood and thereby the reality of his human nature.

exarch A Byzantine governor combining military and civil authority: for example, the exarch of Italy and the exarch of Africa.

excommunication The word and its cognates was frequently used to refer to a juridical act by a bishop, or group of bishops, when they declared a person or persons excluded from the communion of the Church: that is, from participation in worship or the sacraments. When applied to a cleric, excommunication implied suspension from ecclesiastical office.

fathers Either (1) the bishops attending a council, or (2) those earlier churchmen (the ‘approved fathers’) who had a special place in the church’s tradition as the champions and expounders (or in a few cases the anticipators) of the Nicene (q.v.) faith. This is to be distinguished from the modern use of ‘the Fathers’ to refer to all the (more or less orthodox) theologians of the early church.

florilegium The Latinate equivalent of the Greek-derived word ‘anthology’. The Acts contain several florilegia, both of excerpts from the fathers (q.v.) cited as authoritative and of heretical excerpts deserving condemnation. The compilation of such collections to prove the orthodoxy of a doctrine, or discredit a doctrine, goes back to the Nestorian controversy of the fifth century and reached its height in the monothelite controversy.

Gethsemane The chief biblical support for dyothelitism was the exclamation of Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane shortly before his arrest. They are





430 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

recorded in Lk 22:42 in the form 'Father, if you wish, take this cup from me, but let not my will but yours be done', and in Mt 26:39 in the form 'Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me, yet not as I will but as you will.' See pp. 90–2 above.

hegumen The superior of a religious community, corresponding to an abbot or prior in the West.

hypostasis/hypostatic The Chalcedonian Definition (q.v.) defined that Christ is 'one person and one hypostasis', meaning a single being, viz. the eternal Son of God who took on manhood in the incarnation. 'Hypostatic union' meant a real union of natures in Christ, whereby the Word of God incarnate is the sole personal subject of all Christ's actions and attributes.

impiety Used to mean 'heresy', as the antonym of 'piety' (q.v.).

indiction A tax period of fifteen years, and thence a year, starting on 1 September, in a fifteen-year cycle. The synod of 649 fell in an 'eighth indiction'. The system was still used in some Vatican documents as late as the 1950s.

Istrian schism Most of northern Italy broke off communion with Rome because of the papal acceptance of the condemnation of the Three Chapters (q.v.) by the Second Council of Constantinople (553). The schism continued in Istria until 695, but by 649 the number of sees in this region that still rejected Rome's authority was much reduced.

Leo's Tome See 'Tome of Leo'.

metropolitan Metropolitan bishops were the bishops of cities that were provincial capitals (known as *metropoleis*) or which received the title as a mark of honour.

miaphysite The assertion of 'one nature' (μία φύσις) in Christ, as contrasted to the dyophysite (q.v.) assertion of two natures. The term is a recent coinage, intended (out of ecumenical courtesy) to replace 'monophysite' (q.v.). The miaphysites rejected the Chalcedonian formula of two natures in Christ as Nestorian (q.v.) and insisted that he is one nature, in the sense of a single being, albeit possessing both divine and human attributes. The conflict between the two sides arose from difference of terminology and mutual misrepresentation rather than a real difference in doctrine.

monoenergist/monoenergism The assertion of 'one operation' (q.v.) in Christ, meaning not a denial of either his human or his divine operation, but an insistence that these two were not separate but formed one 'theandric' (q.v.) operation.

monophysite This term, referring to the tenet that Christ has *only* one nature (from Greek *monos* and *physis*) is best avoided, since, though used innocently by historians (as swear-words are by children), it is pejorative, like 'papist'. The terms 'miaphysite' or 'non-Chalcedonian' are to be preferred.

monothelite/monothetism The assertion of 'one will' in Christ, meaning not a denial of his human will (though critics of the doctrine made this allegation) but an insistence that it was always in harmony with his divine will.





nature The Godhead and manhood of Christ constitute ‘two natures’, according to the Chalcedonian Definition (q.v.), where the expression is balanced by that of ‘one hypostasis’ (q.v.).

neo-Chalcedonianism A sixth-century reinterpretation of the Christology of the Chalcedonian Definition (q.v.) that sought to reconcile its dyophysite (q.v.) terminology with the full teaching of Cyril of Alexandria. It was adopted by the emperor Justinian and the Second Council of Constantinople (553) and formed the basis of subsequent Byzantine orthodoxy.

Nestorian(ism) The heresy that separates the two natures of Christ, Godhead and manhood, into two distinct persons, two distinguishable ‘Sons of God’, associated with each other in harmony of will and status but not united ontologically. It was a misrepresentation of the Christology developed by Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428) and championed by Nestorius (d. c.450) and Theodoret (d. c.460). The adjective is often used of the Church of the East (the ancient church of Persia), which, though not ‘Nestorian’ (in the sense just defined), refused to condemn Nestorius.

Nicaea/Nicene The Nicene Creed, issued by the Council of Nicaea (325), was regarded as the fundamental expression of Christian dogma. It entered the liturgy in the form of a variant version associated with the Council of Constantinople of 381.

notary Each of the regions of the city of Rome had its own ‘regional notary’, of whom several assisted at the synod of 649. They formed a *schola*, under the *primicerius* or chief notary, who was responsible for all papal correspondence, as well as the papal archives.

oikonomia See ‘economy’.

operation The word ἐνέργεια, for which the Latin is *operatio* and the most common English renderings are ‘energy’ and ‘operation’, refers to the activity and movement of a particular nature or individual and the changes it either effects or experiences.

patriarch By the seventh century this title was reserved for the bishops of the patriarchal sees of Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria. Eastern documents occasionally referred to the pope as a patriarch (that is, of the Latin west), but the popes themselves never took this title.

Pentapolis A group of five cities. The one relevant in our context is that in Picenum (south of Ravenna), consisting of Ariminum, Pisaurum, Fanum, Senegallica and Ancona. The last four of these sees were all represented at the synod of 649.

piety εὐσέβεια (*pietas* in Latin). Most often used to refer to doctrinal orthodoxy.

presbyter The second clerical rank, intermediate between bishop and deacon (q.v.). In the pre-Nicene period the prime role of the presbyters was to form the council that advised the bishop. With the multiplication of churches after Constantine, the presbyter became the celebrant of the liturgy in non-cathedral churches.

priest The word derives from ‘presbyter’ (q.v.), but is the standard translation of ἱερεύς and *sacerdos*, terms which were used primarily of bishops.





primicerius The 'first' of a group of civil or ecclesiastical functionaries. Theophylact, *primicerius* of the Roman notaries (q.v.), had a prominent role at the synod of 649.

Psẽphos Issued by Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople in 633/4, it banned talk of either one operation or two operations in Christ. It was confirmed a few years later by the *Ekthesis* (q.v.).

psilanthropism The heresy of which Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia stood accused that held that Christ was a 'mere man' (ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος).

symbol A synonym of 'creed'.

syncellus The principal adviser and assistant of a patriarch.

synod Often used as a collective noun for the bishops of a province. Also used of meetings of bishops. Note that the distinction in English between 'council' and 'synod' (the latter term being reserved for local councils) does not exist in Greek, where σύνοδος is used for both. Latin texts use *synodus* and *concilium* interchangeably as straight synonyms.

synodical letter A letter written by a patriarch or pope to the other patriarchs on the occasion of his election, containing a profession of faith.

theandric A Greek word meaning 'divine-human', famously used by Dionysius the Areopagite (*ep.* 4) to describe the operation of Christ.

Three Chapters The emperor Justinian in 544/5 and then the Council of Constantinople of 553 issued a condemnation of three items (the 'Three Chapters'): the person and writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the writings of Theodoret against Cyril of Alexandria, and the purported letter of Ibas of Edessa to Mari the Persian. Pope Vigilius reluctantly confirmed this condemnation several months after the close of the council.

Tome of Leo A letter from Pope Leo the Great to Flavian of Constantinople of 13 June 449, condemning the heresy of Eutychianism (q.v.). It contained the statement that 'each form [nature of Christ's] performs what is proper to it in communion with the other', which sounded Nestorian (q.v.) to many easterners and was later a key text for dyoenergists.

Trisagion A liturgical acclamation ('Holy God, Holy strong, Holy immortal, have mercy on us'). From the time when the miaphysites (q.v.) added 'who was crucified for us' to the second clause, to bring out their insistence that the passion is to be ascribed to God the Word, the wording of the prayer became a battleground.

Typos Composed by Paul of Constantinople and issued by Constans II in 648, it banned any further discussion of the numbers of wills and operations in Christ as detrimental to church unity.

Vicar Deputy or representative. The archbishop of Thessalonica was the papal vicar in the Balkans. Stephen of Dora and John of Philadelphia were, successively, appointed as papal vicars in Syria-Palestine.





BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. PRIMARY SOURCES

- Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* [ACO], ed. Eduard Schwartz (Berlin 1914–).
- Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, Series Secunda [ACO²], I, *Concilium Lateranense a. 649 celebratum*, ed. Rudolf Riedinger (Berlin 1984).
- Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, Series Secunda, II, *Concilium Universale Constantinopolitanum Tertium*, ed. Rudolf Riedinger, 2 parts (Berlin 1990–2).
- Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, Series Secunda, III, *Concilium Universale Nicaenum Secundum*, ed. Erich Lamberz, 3 parts (Berlin 2008–).
- Ado of Vienne, *Chronicle*, PL 123. 23–138.
- Agapius, *Universal History*, ed. A.-A. Vasiliev, ‘Kitab al-’Unvan (Histoire universelle écrite par Agapius e Menbidj) Part 2.2, PO 8/3 (1912).
- Agnellus, *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Oswald Holder-Egger, MGH, Scr. Rer. Lang. et Ital. (1878) 265–391.
- Ambrose, *De fide ad Gratianum Augustum*, ed. Otto Faller, CSEL 78 (Vienna 1962).
- ‘Amr b. Matta, *The Tower*, in H. Gismondi, ed., *Maris, Amri, et Salibae: De Patriarchis Nestorianorum Commentaria* (2 vols, Rome 1896–9) vol. 1.
- Anastasius of Sinai, *Against the Monotheletes*, ed. K.-H. Uthemann, *Sermones duo in constitutionem hominis secundum imaginem dei*, CCSG 12 (Turnhout 1985) 35–83.
- Anastasius the Disciple, *Letter to the Monks of Cagliari*, ed. Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil, *Scripta Saeculi VII Vitam Maximi Confessoris Illustrantia*, CCSG 39 (Turnhout 1999), 166–9; Allen and Neil (2002) 124–30.
- Anonymous Chronicle to 741*, ed. T. Mommsen, *Chronica Minora Saec. IV. V. VI. VII*, vol. 2, MGH, Auct. Ant. 11 (Berlin 1894) 334–59.
- Anonymous Chronicle to 754*, ed. T. Mommsen, *Chronica Minora Saec. IV. V. VI. VII*, vol. 2, MGH, Auct. Ant. 11 (Berlin 1894) 334–68.
- Anonymous Chronicle to 1234*, ed. J.-B. Chabot, *Chronicon Anonymum ad Annum Christi 1234 Pertinens*, CSCO 81–2 = *Scriptores Syri* 36–7 (2 vols, Leuven 1916–20).
- Anonymous Life of John the Almsgiver*, ed. H. Delehaye, ‘Une Vie inédite de Saint Jean l’Aumonier’, *Anal. Boll.* 45 (1927) 19–25.
- Antiochus Monachus, *Pandects*, PG 89. 1421–849.





434 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

- Apollinarius of Laodicea. See Lietzmann (1904).
- Aristotle, *Physics*, ed. W.D. Ross (Oxford 1936).
- Basil of Caesarea, *Letters*: Saint Basile, *Lettres*, ed. Yves Courtonne, 3 vols (Paris 1957–66).
- Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, ed. B. Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford 1969).
- Benjamin, *Sermon on the Feast of Cana*, ed. H. De Vis, ‘Sermon de Benjamin sur les Noces de Cana’, in id. (ed.), *Homélies Coptes de la Vaticane* (Louvain 1990) 53–106.
- Boethius, *The Theological Tractates*, ed. H.F. Stewart *et al.* (Cambridge MA 1973).
- Book of Ceremonies*, ed. I. Reiske, *Constantini Porphyrogeniti Imperatoris De Ceremoniis Aulae Byzantinae Libri Duo* (2 vols, Bonn 1829–30).
- Chronicle of Seert*, ed. A. Scher, ‘Histoire Nestorienne: Chronique de Séert’, PO 4–5, 7, 13 (1908–19).
- Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, vol. 3 (Turnhout 1979).
- Columbanus, *Epistulae*, in *Sancti Columbani Opera*, ed. G.S.M. Walker (Dublin 1970) 2–59.
- Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta*, I: *The Ecumenical Councils from Nicaea I to Nicaea II (325–787)*, ed. G. Alberigo *et al.* (Turnhout 2006).
- Constans, *Letter to Pope John IV*. German trans. from Karshuni in Schacht (1936) 246–9; Latin trans. in A. Mai, *Noua Patrum bibliotheca* VI (Rome 1954) 511–12.
- Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on the Gospel of John (In D. Joannis Evangelium)*, ed. P.E. Pusey, 3 vols (Oxford 1872).
- , *Commentary on the Gospel of Saint Luke*, trans. R. Payne Smith (Studion 1983).
- , *Select Letters*, ed. and trans. L.R. Wickham (Oxford 1983).
- Cyrus of Alexandria, *First Letter to Sergius* ed. R. Riedinger in ACO² II/2, 588–92; Allen (2009) 160–2.
- , *Second Letter to Sergius* in ACO² II/2, 592–4; Allen (2009) 174–6.
- , *Plerophoria*, ACO² II.2, 594–600; Allen (2009) 168–73.
- Disputation at Bizye*, ed. P. Allen and B. Neil, *Scripta Saeculi VII Vitam Maximi Confessoris Illustrantia*, CCSG 39 (Turnhout 1999) 73–151; Allen and Neil (2002) 76–119.
- Disputation with Pyrrhus*, PG 91. 288–353.
- Doctrina Patrum*, ed. F. Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum de incarnatione Verbi. Ein griechisches Florilegium aus der Wende des 7. Und 8. Jahrhunderts* (Munster 1907).
- Enchiridion Symbolorum Definitionum et Declarationum*, ed. H. Denzinger and A. Schönmetzer, 34th edition (Freiburg im Breisgau 1967).
- Epiphanius, *Panarion*, ed. Karl Holl, vol. 2, GCS 31 (Leipzig 1922) and vol. 3, GCS 37 (Leipzig 1933). Trans. Frank Williams, Bk I (Leiden 1987), Bks II–III (Leiden 1994).





- Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae et quae ad eos scriptae sunt a S. Hilario usque ad Pelagium II*, ed. Andreas Thiel, vol. 1 (Brunsberg 1868).
- Epitome of the Life of John the Almsgiver*, ed. E. Lappa-Zizicas, 'Un épitomé de la Vie de S. Jean l'Aumônier par Jean et Sophronius', *Anal. Boll.* 88 (1970) 265–78.
- Eubulus of Lystra, *Against the libellus of Athanasius to the Emperor Heraclius*, ed. F. Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum de incarnatione Verbi. Ein griechisches Florilegium aus der Wende des 7. Und 8. Jahrhunderts* (Munster 1907) 141–8.
- Eutychius, *Annals (Alexandrian Recension)* ed. M. Breydy, *Das Annalenwerk des Eutychios von Alexandrien*, CSCO 471 = Scriptores Arabici 44 (Leuven 1985).
- , *Annals (Antiochene Recension)* ed. L. Cheiko, *Eutychii patriarchae Alexandrini Annales*, CSCO 50–1 (Beirut 1906–9).
- Fredegar, *Chronicle*, ed. J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Fourth Book of the Chronicle of Fredegar with Its Continuations* (London 1960).
- Georgius Monachus (= Hamartolus), *Chronicon*, ed. C. de Boor, 2 vols (Stuttgart 1904).
- George of Pisidia, *On the Restoration of the Cross*, ed. A. Pertusi, *Giorgio di Pisidia Poemi: I. Panegirici Epici* (Ettal 1959) 225–30.
- Georgian Appendix to the Spiritual Meadow*, Latin trans. in Gérard Garitte, '«Histoires Édifiantes» Géorgiennes', *Byzantion* 36 (1966) 406–23.
- Gregory the Great, *Registrum epistularum*, ed. D. Norberg, CCSL 140, 140A (Turnhout 1982). Trans. John Martyn, *The Letters of Gregory the Great*, 3 vols (Toronto 2004).
- Gregory of Nyssa, *Opera*, ed. W. Jaeger *et al.*, 11 vols to date (Leiden 1958–).
- History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria*, ed. B. Evetts, 'History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria', PO 1 (1904) 99–214, 381–518; 5 (1910) 1–215; 10 (1915) 357–552.
- Honorius, *First Letter to Sergius*, ACO² II/2, 548–58; Allen (2009) 194–204.
- , *Second Letter to Sergius*, ACO² II/2, 620–5; Allen (2009) 204–8.
- Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ Miṣr* ed. C. Torrey, *Futūḥ Miṣr wa-akhbārūhā* (New Haven CT 1922); partial trans. in id., 'The Mohammedan Conquest of Egypt and North Africa in the Years 643 to 705 A.D.', *Biblical and Semitic Studies: Critical and Historical Essays by the Members of the Semitic and Biblical Faculty of Yale University* (New York 1901) 277–330.
- Isaac the Presbyter, *Life of Samuel of Kalamon*, ed. A. Alcock, *The Life of Samuel of Kalamon by Isaac the Presbyter* (Warminster 1983).
- Isho'yahb II, *Christological Letter*, ed. L.R.M. Sako, *Lettre christologique du Patriarche Syro-Oriental Īṣō'yahb de Gdālā (628–46): étude, traduction et édition critique* (Rome 1983).
- John IV, Pope, *Letter in Defence of Honorius*. Latin retrans. from Greek, PL 80. 602–7; German trans. from Karshuni in J. Schacht (1936) 235–46.
- John Moschus, *Spiritual Meadow*, PG 87:3. 2852–3112.





436 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

- John of Damascus, *Expositio fidei*, in B. Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, II (Berlin 1973).
- John of Nikiu, *Chronicle*, ed. H. Zotenberg, *Chronique de Jean, Évêque de Nikiou* (Paris 1883).
- Khuzistan Chronicle*, ed. I. Guidi, *Chronica Minora I*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 1 = Scriptores Syri 1 (Paris 1960) 15–39.
- Konzilssynopse, Eine unbekannte*, ed. L.M. Hoffmann and W. Brandes (Frankfurt am M. 2013).
- Leontius of Neapolis, *Life of John the Almsgiver*, ed. A.J. Festugière in id. and L. Rydén, *Vie de Syméon le Fou et Vie de Jean de Chypre* (Paris 1974) 343–409.
- Liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum*, PL 105. 21–120, and ed. H. Foerster (Bern 1958).
- Liber pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, vol. 1 (Paris 1886 and 1981); trans. R. Davis, *The Book of the Pontiffs: The ancient biographies of the first ninety Roman bishops to AD 715*, TTH 6, 2nd edition (Liverpool 2000).
- Life of Maximus the Confessor*, Greek, PG 90. 68–109.
- Life of Maximus the Confessor*, Syriac, trans. Brock in *Anal. Boll.* 91 (1973) 299–346 = Brock (1984) XII.
- Mari, *History of the Nestorian Patriarchs*, in H. Gismondi, ed., *Maris, Amri, et Salibae: De Patriarchis Nestorianorum Commentaria* (2 vols, Rome 1896–9) vol. 2.
- Martin, Pope, *Letters*, PL 87. 137–98.
- Maximus the Confessor, *Ambigua to John*, ed. E. Jeuneau, *Maximi Confessoris Ambigua ad Iohannem iuxta Iohannis Scotti Eriugenae latinam interpretationem*, CCSG 18 (Turnhout 1988).
- , *Ambigua to Thomas*, ed. B. Janssens, *Maximi Confessoris Ambigua ad Thomam una cum Epistula Secunda ad eundem*, CCSG 48 (Turnhout 2002).
- , *Exposition on the Lord's Prayer*, ed. P. van den Ven, *Maximi Confessoris opuscula exegetica duo*, CCSG 23 (Turnhout 1991) 3–22.
- , *Letter to Anastasius the Disciple*, ed. P. Allen and B. Neil, *Scripta Saeculi VII Vitam Maximi Confessoris Illustrantia*, CCSG 39 (Turnhout 1999) 160–3; Allen and Neil (2002) 120–2.
- , *Letter to Thalassius*, PG 129. 583–6.
- , *Mystagogy*, ed. C. Boudignon, *Maximi Confessoris Mystagogia*, CCSG 69 (Turnhout 2011).
- , *Questions to Thalassius*, ed. C. Laga and C. Steel, *Maximi Confessoris Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, 2 vols, CCSG 7, 22 (Turnhout 1980–90).
- Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle*, ed. J.-B. Chabot, 4 vols (Paris 1899–1910).
- Milo: see *Vitae Amandi episcopi*.
- Narration on Armenian Affairs*, ed. G. Garitte, *La Narratio de Rebus Armeniae*, CSCO 132 Subsidia 4 (Leuven 1952).
- Nicephorus, *Short History*, ed. C. Mango, *Nikephoros Patriarch of Constantinople: Short History* (Washington, DC 1990).





- Paul the Deacon, *History of the Lombards*, ed. L. Capo, *Paolo Diacono Storia dei Longobardi* (Verona 1992).
- Photius, *Bibliotheca*, ed. R. Henry, *Photius: Bibliothèque*, 8 vols (Paris 1959–77). *Plerophoria*, ACO² II/2, 594–600; Allen (2009) 168–72.
- Prologue to the Spiritual Meadow*, ed. H. Usener, *Der Heilige Tychon* (Leipzig 1907) 91–3.
- Ps.-Dionysius, *Corpus Dionysiacum*, 2 vols, PTS 33 and 36 (Berlin 1990–1).
- Ps.-Sebeōs, *History*, ed. G. Abgaryan, *Patmut'iwn Sebēosi* (Erevan 1979).
- Relatio motionis* or *Record of the Trial*, ed. and trans. Allen and Neil (2002) 48–74.
- Return of the Relics of Anastasius the Persian*, ed. B. Flusin, *Saint Anastase le Perse et l'histoire de la Palestine au début du VIIe siècle*, 2 vols (Paris 1992) vol. 1, 99–107.
- Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. J.-D. Mansi, 31 vols (Florence and Venice 1759–98, repr. Paris and Leipzig 1901–6).
- Septuagint, ed. A. Rahlfs, 2 vols (Stuttgart 1935).
- Sergius of Constantinople, *First Letter to Cyrus* ed. R. Riedinger in *Acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council* 528–30; Allen (2009) 162–6.
- , *First Letter to Honorius*, ACO² II/2; Allen (2009) 182–94.
- Socrates, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G.C. Hansen (Berlin 1995).
- Sophronius, *Anacreontics*, ed. M. Gigante, *Sophronii Anacreontica* (Rome 1957).
- , *Letter to Arcadius of Cyprus*, ed. M. Albert and C. von Schönborn, *La lettre de Sophrone de Jérusalem à Arcadius de Chypre*, PO 39 (1978).
- , *Miracles of Cyrus and John*, ed. N.F. Marcos, *Los Thaumata de Sofronio: Contribucion al Estudio de la Incubatio Cristiana* (Madrid 1975); trans. J. Gascou, *Sophrone de Jérusalem: Miracles des Saints Cyr et Jean* (Paris 2006).
- , *On the Nativity* ed. H. Usener, 'Weihnachtspredigt des Sophronios', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 41 (1886) 500–16.
- , *Synodical Letter*, ACO² II/2, 410–94; Allen (2009) 66–156.
- Strategius, *On the Fall of Jerusalem*, ed. (Georgian) G. Garitte, *La Prise de Jérusalem par les Perses en 614*, CSCO 202–3 = *Scriptores Iberici* 11–12 (Leuven 1960); ed. (Arabic) G. Garitte, *Expugnationis Hierosolymae A.D. 614 Recensiones Arabicae*, CSCO 340–1, 347–8 = *Scriptores Arabici* 26–9 (Leuven 1973–4).
- Synodikon Vetus*, ed. John Duffy and John Parker, CFHB 15 (Washington, DC 1979).
- Theodore, Pope, *Letter to Constans II*. German trans. from Karshuni in (1936) 246–9; Latin trans. in A. Mai, *Noua Patrum bibliotheca* VI (Rome 1954) 510–11.
- , *Letter to Paul of Constantinople*, PL 87. 75–80.
- , *Letter to the bishops who consecrated Paul Patriarch of Constantinople*, PL 87. 81–2.





438 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

- Theodore Spudaeus, *Hypomnesticum* (Greek) ed. P. Allen and B. Neil, *Scripta Saeculi VII Vitam Maximi Confessoris Illustrantia*, CCSG 39 (Turnhout 1999) 197–227; Allen and Neil (2002) 148–70.
- , *Hypomnesticum* (Latin) ed. Neil (2006a) 234–64.
- , *Narrations concerning the Exile of the Holy Pope Martin*, ed. Neil (2006a) 166–232.
- Theophanes, *Chronicle*, ed. C. de Boor, *Theophanis Chronographia* (Leipzig 1883).
- Theophylact Simocatta, *History*, ed. C. de Boor and P. Wirth, *Theophylacti Simocattae Historiae* (Stuttgart 1972).
- Thomas Artsruni, *History of the House of the Artsrunik*, ed. K. Patkanean (St Petersburg 1887), repr. *Thomas Artsruni, History of the House of Artsrunik: A facsimile reproduction with an introduction by Robert W. Thomson* (Delmar NY 1991)
- Thomas of Marga, *Books of Governors*, ed. E.A. Wallis Budge, 2 vols (London 1883).
- Translation of the Relics of Anastasius the Persian*, ed. B. Flusin, *Saint Anastase le Perse et l'histoire de la Palestine au début du VIIe siècle*, 2 vols (Paris) vol. 1, 99–107.
- Vita Eligii*, MGH, Scr. Rer. Merov. 4 (1902) 634–761.
- Vitae Amandi episcopi*, MGH, Scr. Rer. Merov. 5 (1910) 395–485.

2. SECONDARY LITERATURE

- Alexakis, Alexander (1995–96), ‘Before the Lateran Council of 649: The Last Days of Herakleios the Emperor and Monotheletism’, *AHC* 27–28: 93–101.
- (1996), *Codex Parisinus Graecus 115 and its Archetype*, Dunbarton Oaks Studies 34 (Washington DC).
- Allen, Pauline (2009), *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy: The Synodical Letter and other Documents* (Oxford).
- Allen, Pauline and Bronwen Neil (2002), *Maximus the Confessor and his Companions: Documents from Exile* (Oxford).
- Azzara, Claudio (1997), *L'ideologia del potere regio nel papato altomedievale (secoli VI–VIII)* (Spoleto).
- (2002), ‘The papacy’, in Cristina La Rocca, ed., *Italy in the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford) 102–17.
- Bathrellos, Demetrios (2004), *The Byzantine Christ: Person, Nature, and Will in the Christology of St Maximus the Confessor* (Oxford).
- Bausenhardt, G. (1992), ‘In allem uns gleich außer der Sünde’: *Studien zum Beitrag Maximos' des Bekenner zu altkirchlichen Christologie* (Mainz).
- Bavant, B. (1979), ‘Le duché byzantin de Rome: Origine, durée et extension





- géographique', *Mélanges de l'Ecole Française de Rome, Moyen Age, Temps Modernes*, 41–88.
- Berthold, G.C. (2010), 'Aspects of the Will in Maximus the Confessor', *StPat* 48: 65–9.
- Bertolini, O. (1952), 'Il patrizio Isacio esarca d'Italia', *Atti del 2 congresso internazionale di studi sull'alto medioevo. Grado, Aquileia, Gorizia, Cividale, Udine, 7–11 settembre 1952* (Spoleto) 117–20.
- [Bolotov, V.V.] (1898), 'Thesen über das "Filioque", von einem russischen Theologen', *Revue internationale de Théologie* 24: 681–711.
- Booth, Phil (2013a), *Crisis of Empire: Doctrine and Dissent at the End of Late Antiquity* (Berkeley).
- (2013b), 'The Muslim Conquest of Egypt Reconsidered', in C. Zuckerman, ed., *Constructing the Seventh Century, Travaux et mémoires* 17: 639–70.
- (2013c), 'Gregory and the Greek East', in B. Neil and M.J. Dal Santo, eds, *A Companion to Gregory the Great* (Leiden) 109–31.
- Borias, A. (1987), 'Saint Wandrille et la crise monothélite', *RBén* 97:42–67.
- Börjessen, Johannes (forthcoming), 'Maximus on the Will', in P. Allen and B. Neil, eds, *The Oxford Handbook to Maximus the Confessor* (Oxford), ch. 11.
- Boudignon, Christian (2004), 'Maxime le confesseur: était-il constantinopolitain?' in B. Janssens, B. Rosen and P. van Deun, eds, *Philomathestatos: Studies in Greek Patristic and Byzantine Texts presented to Jacques Noret* (Louvain) 11–43.
- (2007), 'Le pouvoir de l'anathème: ou Maxime le Confesseur et les moines palestiniens du VIIe siècle', in A. Camplani and G. Filoramo, eds, *Foundations of Power and Conflicts of Authority in Late-Antique Monasticism. Proceedings of the International Seminar, Turin, 2–4 December 2004* (Leuven) 245–74.
- Boulnois, Marie-Odile (1994), *Le paradox trinitaire chez Cyrille d'Alexandrie* (Paris).
- Bracken, Damian (2002), 'Authority and Duty: Columbanus and the Primacy of Rome', *Peritia* 16: 168–213.
- Brandenburg, Hugo (2005) *Ancient Churches of Rome from the fourth to the seventh century* (Turnhout).
- Brandes, Wolfram (1998), '"Juristische" Krisenbewältigung im 7. Jahrhundert? Die Prozesse gegen Martin I. und Maximos Homologetes', *Fontes Minores* 10: 141–212.
- (2001), 'Konstantin der Grosse in den monothelischen Streitigkeit des 7. Jahrhunderts', in E. Kuntura-Galaki, ed., *The Dark Centuries of Byzantium (7–9th c.)* (Athens) 89–107.
- (2003), 'Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Seventh Century: Prosopographical Observations on Monothelism', in A. Cameron, ed., *Fifty Years of Prosopography, The Later Roman Empire, Byzantium and Beyond*, Proceedings of the British Academy 118: 103–18.





440 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

- Bréhier, Louis and René Aigrain (1938), *Histoire de L'Église 5: Grégoire le Grand, les États barbares et la conquête arabe (590–757)* (Paris).
- Brock, Sebastian (1973), 'An early Syriac Life of Maximus the Confessor', *Anal. Boll.* 91: 299–346.
- (1981), 'The Conversations with the Syrian Orthodox under Justinian (532)', *OCP* 47: 87–121 = Brock (1992), XIII.
- (1984), *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity* (Variorum).
- (1985), 'A Monothelete florilegium in Syriac' in Laga *et al.* (1985), 35–45 = Brock (1992), XIV.
- (1986), 'Two sets of monothelete questions to the Maximianists', *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 17: 119–40 = Brock (1992), XV.
- (1992), *Studies in Syriac Christianity* (Variorum).
- Brown, Peter (2012), *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350–550 AD* (Princeton, NJ).
- Brown, T.S. (1979), 'The Church of Ravenna and the imperial administration in the seventh century', *EHR* 94: 1–28.
- Brufani, Stefano (1992), 'L'Umbria e Todi nella prima metà del secolo VII', in *Martino I papa (649–653) el il suo tempo, Atti del XXVIII convegno storico internazionale Todi 13–16 ottobre 1991* (Todi).
- Caspar, Erich (1932), 'Die Lateransynode von 649', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 51: 75–137.
- (1933), *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe des Weltherrschaft*, II: *Das Papsttum unter Byzantinischer Herrschaft* (Tübingen).
- Chadwick, Henry (1974), 'John Moschus and his friend Sophronius the Sophist', *JTS* n.s. 25: 41–74.
- (1981), *Boethius: The Consolations of Music, Logic, Theology, and Philosophy* (Oxford).
- Charlton, William (1970), *Aristotle Physics Books I and II*, translation and commentary (Oxford).
- Chavassee, A. (1952), 'Les plus anciens types du lectionnaire et de l'antiphonaire romains de la messe', *RBén* 62: 3–94.
- Chazelle, Celia and Catherine Cubitt, eds (2007), *The Crisis of the Oikoumene: The Three Chapters and the Failed Quest for Unity in the Sixth-Century Mediterranean* (Turnhout).
- Chesnut, Roberta C. (1976), *Three Monophysite Christologies: Severus of Antioch, Philoxenus of Mabbug, and Jacob of Serug* (Oxford).
- Chiesa, P. (1992) 'Le biografie greche e latine di papa Martino I', in *Martino I papa (649–53) e il suo tempo* (Spoleto) 211–41.
- Christie, Neil (1990), 'Byzantine Liguria: an Imperial Province against the Longobards, A.D. 568–643', *PBSR* 58: 229–71.
- Claridge, Amanda (1998), *Rome: An Oxford Archaeological Guide* (Oxford).
- Coates-Stephens, Robert (2006), 'Byzantine Building Patronage in post-Reconquest Rome', in M. Ghilardi, Christophe J. Goddard, and Pierfrancesco Porena, eds,





- Les Cités d'Italie tardo-antique (ive-vie siècle)*, Collection de L'École française de Rome 369: 149–66.
- Conte, Pietro (1971), *Chiesa e Primato nelle lettere dei papi del secolo VII* (Rome).
- (1989), *Il Sinodo Lateranense dell'ottobre 649* (Vatican City).
- (1991), 'Il "Consortium fidei apostolicae" tra vescovo di Roma e vescovi nel secolo VII', in *Il Primato del Vescovo di Roma nel Primo Millennio Ricerche e Testimonianze Atti del Symposium Storico-Teologico Roma, 9–13 Ottobre 1989*, ed. Michele Maccarrone (Vatican City) 363–431.
- Cooper, Adam G. (2005), *The Body in St Maximus the Confessor: Holy Flesh, Wholly Deified* (Oxford).
- Cosentino, Salvatore (1993), 'L'Iscrizione Ravennate dell'esarco Isacio e le guerre di Rotari' in *Atti e memorie della Deputazione di Storia patria per le Antiche province modenesi* 11.15 (Modena) 23–43.
- (2004), 'Byzantine Sardinia between West and East. Features of a Regional Culture', *Millennium* 1: 329–67.
- Cremascoli, G. (1992), 'Le lettere di Martino I', in *Martino I papa (649–653) e il suo tempo* (Spoleto) 243–58.
- Cubitt, Catherine (2009), 'The Lateran Council as an Ecumenical Council', in R. Price and M. Whitby, eds, *Chalcedon in Context: Church Councils 400–700* (Liverpool) 133–47.
- (2013), 'St Wilfrid: a Man for his Times', in N.J. Higham, ed., *Wilfrid Abbot, Bishop, Saint Papers from the 1300th Anniversary Conferences* (Donington) 311–47.
- Dagron, Gilbert (1990), 'La règle de exception. Analyse de la notion d'économie', in D. Simon, ed., *Religiose Devianz: Untersuchungen zu sozialen, rechtlichen und theologischen Reaktionen auf religiöse Abweichung im westlichen und östlichen Mittelalter* (Frankfurt) 1–18.
- (2003), *Emperor and Priest: The Imperial Office in Byzantium* (Cambridge).
- Daley, Brian E. (2008), 'Making a human will divine: Augustine and Maximus on Christ and human salvation', in G.E. Demacopoulos and A. Papanikolaou, eds, *Orthodox Readings of Augustine* (Crestwood) 101–26.
- Dal Santo, Matthew (2012), *Debating the Saints' Cult in the Age of Gregory the Great* (Oxford).
- (2013), 'Gregory the Great, the Empire and the Emperor', in B. Neil and M.J. Dal Santo, eds, *A Companion to Gregory the Great* (Leiden) 57–81.
- Davis-Weyer, Caecilia (1989), 'S. Stefano Rotondo and the Oratory of Theodore I', in W. Tronzo, ed., *Italian Church Decoration of the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance*, Villa Spelman Colloquia I: 61–80.
- Delogu, Paolo (2000), 'The Papacy, Rome and the Wider World in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries', in Julia M.H. Smith, ed., *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West Essays in Honour of Donald A. Bullough* (Leiden) 197–220.
- Deliyannis, Deborah Mauskopf (2010), *Ravenna in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge).





442 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

- Demacopoulos, George E. (2013), *The Invention of Peter: Apostolic Discourse and Papal Authority in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia PA).
- Déroche, Vincent (1995), *Études sur Léontios de Néapolis* (Upsala).
- Devreesse, R. (1937), 'La fin inédite d'une lettre de Saint Maxime: un baptême forcé de Juifs et de Samaritans à Carthage en 632', *Revue des sciences religieuses* 17: 25–35.
- Di Berardino, Angelo, ed. (1992), *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, 2 vols (Cambridge).
- (2006), *Patrology: The Eastern Fathers from the Council of Chalcedon (451) to John of Damascus (d. 750)* (Cambridge).
- Diehl C. (1896), *L'Afrique byzantine: Histoire de la domination byzantine en Afrique 533–709* (Paris).
- Doucet, Marcel (1983), 'Est-ce que le monothélisme a fait autant d'illustres victimes? Réflexions sur un ouvrage de F.-M. Léthel', *Science et Esprit* 35: 53–83.
- (1985), 'La volonté humaine du Christ, spécialement en son agonie: Maxime le Confesseur, interprète de l'Écriture', *Science et Esprit* 37: 123–59.
- Drijvers, H.J.W. (2002), 'Heraclius and the *Restitutio Crucis*: Notes on Symbolism and Ideology', in G.J. Reinink and B.H. Stolte, eds, *The Reign of Heraclius (610–641): Crisis and Confrontation* (Leuven) 175–90.
- Duval, Yvette (1971), 'Le Patrice Pierre, exarque d'Afrique?' *Antiquités africaines* 5: 209–14.
- Ekonomou, A.J. (2007), *Byzantine Rome and the Greek Popes: Eastern influences on Rome and the papacy from Gregory the Great to Zacharias, A.D. 590–752* (Plymouth).
- Eno, Robert (1989), 'Papal Damage Control in the Aftermath of the Three Chapters Controversy', *StPat* 19: 52–6.
- Flusin, Bernard (1992), *Saint Anastase le Perse et l'histoire de la Palestine au début du VIIe siècle*, 2 vols (Paris).
- Follieri, Enrica (1988), 'Dove e quando morì Giovanni Mosco?' *Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici* n.s. 25: 3–39.
- Foss, Clive (1975), 'The Persians in Asia Minor and the End of Antiquity', *EHR* 90: 721–47.
- (2003), 'The Persians in the Roman Near East (602–630 AD)', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* Ser. 3, 13.2: 149–70.
- Fitzgerald, Allan D. (1999), *Augustine through the Ages* (Grand Rapids MI).
- Fritze, W.H. (1969), 'Universalis gentium confession: Formeln, Träger und Wege universalmissionarischen Denkens im 7. Jahrhundert', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 3: 78–130.
- Garitte, Gérard (1952), *La Narratio de Rebus Armeniae*, CSCO 132, Subsidia 4 (Leuven).
- Garrigues, J.M. (1976), 'Le martyre de saint Maxime le Confesseur', *RevThom* 76: 410–52.





- Gouillard, J. (1968), 'Aux origins de l'iconoclasme: le témoignage de Grégoire II', *Travaux et Mémoires* 3: 243–307.
- Graumann, Thomas (2002), *Die Kirche der Väter: Vätertheologie und Väterbeweis in den Kirchen des Ostens bis zum Konzil von Ephesus (431)* (Tübingen).
- (2009) '«Reading» the First Council of Ephesus', in Price and Whitby (2009) 27–44.
- (2011) 'Orthodoxy, Authority and the (Re-) Construction of the Past in Church Councils', in Jörg Ulrich *et al.*, eds, *Invention, Rewriting, Usurpation: Discursive Fights over Religious Traditions in Antiquity* (Frankfurt am M.) 219–37.
- Gray, Patrick T.R. and Michael Herren (1994), 'Columbanus and the Three Chapters Controversy – a New Approach', *JTS* n.s. 45: 160–70.
- Greenwood, Tim W. (2008), '"New Light from the East": Chronography and Ecclesiastical History through a Late Seventh-Century Armenian Source', *J ECS* 16: 197–254.
- Grillmeier, Aloys (1987), *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2: *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590–604)*, Pt 1: *Reception and Contradiction: The development of the discussion about Chalcedon from 451 to the beginning of the reign of Justinian* (London).
- (1995), *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2: *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590–604)*, Pt 2: *The Church in Constantinople in the Sixth Century* (London).
- Hage, W. (2004), 'Athanasios Gammala und sein Treffen mit Kaiser Herakleios in Mabbug', in M. Tamcke, ed., *Syriaca II: Beiträge zum 3. Deutschen Syrologen-Symposium in Vierzehneiligen 2002* (Münster) 165–74.
- Hagedorn, U. and D. Hagedorn (2011) 'Monotheletisch interpretierte Väterzitate und eine Anleihe bei Johannes Chrysostomus in dem Kölner Osterfestbrief', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 178: 143–57.
- Haldon, J.F. (1985), 'Ideology and the Byzantine State in the Seventh Century: The "Trial" of Maximus the Confessor', in V. Vavrinek, ed., *From Late Antiquity to Early Byzantium* (Prague) 87–91.
- (1990), *Byzantium in the Seventh Century: The Transformation of a Culture* (Cambridge).
- Halleux, André de (1992), 'Les douze chapitres cyrilliens au concile d'Ephèse (430–433)', *RThL* 23: 425–58.
- (1993), 'La distinction des natures du Christ "par la seule pensée" au cinquième concile oecuménique', in Mircea Păcurariu and I.I. Ică, eds, *Persoană și Comuniune* (Sibiu) 311–18.
- Hausammann, Susanne (2004), *Alte Kirche, 4: Das Christusbekenntnis in Ost und West* (Neukirchener-Vluyn).
- Hefele, C.J. and H. Leclercq (1909), *Histoire des Conciles d'après les documents originaux*, III.1 (Paris).
- (1910), *Histoire des Conciles d'après les documents originaux*, III.2 (Paris).





444 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

- Hoffmann, L.M. and W. Brandes, *Eine unbekannte Konzilssynopse*: see *Konzilssynopse*.
- Hovorun, Cyril (2008), *Will, Action and Freedom: Christological Controversies in the Seventh Century* (Leiden).
- Howard-Johnston, James (1994), 'The official history of Heraclius' Persian campaigns', in E. Dąbrowa, ed., *The Roman and Byzantine Army in the East* (Krakow) 57–87.
- (1995), 'The Siege of Constantinople in 626', in C. Mango and G. Dagron, eds, *Constantinople and Its Hinterland* (Aldershot) 131–42.
- (1999), 'Historical Commentary' in R. Thomson and J. Howard-Johnston, *The Armenian History Attributed to Sebeos* (Liverpool) vol. 2.
- (2004), 'Pride and fall: Khusrō II and his regime, 626–8', in G. Gnoli, ed., *La Persia e Bisanzio* (Rome) 93–113.
- (2010), *Witnesses to a World Crisis: Historians and Histories of the Middle East in the Seventh Century* (Oxford).
- Hoyland, Robert G. (1997), *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It: A Survey and Evaluation of Christian, Jewish and Zoroastrian Writings on Early Islam* (Princeton NJ).
- Humphries, Mark (2007), 'From emperor to pope? Ceremonial, space, and authority at Rome from Constantine to Gregory the Great', in Kate Cooper and Julia Hillner, eds, *Religion, Dynasty, and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300–900* (Cambridge) 21–58.
- Jankowiak, Marek (2009), *Essai d'histoire politique du monothélisme*, doctoral thesis, Paris-Warsaw.
- (2013), 'The Invention of Dyothelitism', *StPat* 63 (2013) 335–42.
- Jones, A.H.M. (1964), *The Later Roman Empire 284–602*, 3 vols (Oxford).
- Kaegi, Walter E. (1981), *Byzantine Military Unrest 471–843: An Interpretation* (Amsterdam).
- (2002), *Heraclius: Emperor of Byzantium* (Cambridge).
- Kane, Thomas A. (1949), *The Jurisdiction of the Patriarchs of the Major Sees in Antiquity and in the Middle Ages* (Washington DC).
- Kelly, J.N.D. (1986), *Oxford Dictionary of the Popes* (Oxford).
- Laga, C., Munitiz, J.A. and L. Van Rompay, eds (1985), *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History offered to Professor Albert Van Roey* (Leuven).
- Lange, Christian (2012), *Mia Energeia. Untersuchungen zur Einigungspolitik des Kaisers Heraclius und des Patriarchen Sergius von Constantinopel* (Tübingen).
- Larchet, Jean-Claude (1996), *La divinisation de l'homme selon Maxime le Confesseur* (Paris).
- (1998a), 'Introduction', in *Saint Maxime le Confesseur: Lettres*, tr. E. Ponsoye (Paris) 7–62.
- (1998b), 'Introduction', in *Saint Maxime le Confesseur: Opuscules théologiques et polémiques*, ed. E. Ponsoye (Paris) 7–108.
- (1998c), *Maxime le Confesseur, médiateur entre l'Orient et l'Occident* (Paris).





- Leclercq, H. (1950), 'S.-Saba sur l'Aventin', *DACL* 15.1: 204–9.
- Lesne, E. (1914), '11. Amand (Saint)', *DHGE* 2: 942–5.
- Léthel, F.-M. (1979), *Théologie de l'Agonie du Christ: La liberté humaine du Fils de Dieu et son importance sotériologique mises en lumière par Saint Maxime le Confesseur* (Paris).
- Levison, Wilhelm (1912), 'Die Akten der römischen Synode von 679', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonische Abteilung* 2: 249–82.
- Levy-Rubin, Mika (2001), 'The Role of the Judean Desert Monasteries in the Monothelete Controversy in Seventh-Century Palestine', in J. Patrich, ed., *The Sabaite Heritage in the Orthodox Church from the Fifth Century to the Present* (Leuven) 283–300.
- Lewis and Short (1879), *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford).
- Lietzmann, Hans (1904), *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule* (Tübingen).
- Llewellyn, Peter (1971), *Rome in the Dark Ages* (London).
- (1974), 'The Roman church in the Seventh Century: the Legacy of Gregory I', *JEH* 25: 363–80.
- Loofs, F. (1905), *Nestoriana* (Halle).
- Louth, Andrew (1988) 'Did John Moschus Really Die in Constantinople?' *JTS* n.s. 49: 149–54.
- (1996), *Maximus the Confessor* (London).
- Madden, J.D. (1982), 'The Authenticity of Early Definitions of Will (*thelēsis*)', in F. Heinzer and C. Schönborn, eds, *Maximus Confessor: Actes du Symposium sur Maxim le Confesseur*, Fribourg 2–5 septembre 1980 (Freiburg) 61–79.
- Maccarone, M. (1991), "'Sedes apostolica – vicarius Petri": La Perpetuità del primato di Pietro nella sede e nel vescovo di Roma (secoli III–VIII)', in *Il Primato del Vescovo di Roma nel Primo Millennio, Ricerche e Testimonianze: Atti del Symposium Storico-Teologico Roma, 9–13 Ottobre 1989*, ed. Michele Maccarrone (Vatican City) 275–362.
- MacCoull, Leslie (1990), 'The Paschal Letter of Alexander II, Patriarch of Alexandria: A Greek Defense of Coptic Theology under Arab Rule', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 44: 27–40.
- McCormick, Michael (2001), *Origins of the European Economy Communications and Commerce AD 300–900* (Cambridge).
- Mackie, Gillian (2003), *Early Christian Chapels in the West: Decoration, Function, and Patronage* (Toronto).
- Magi, Luigi (1972), *La Sede Romana nella Corrispondenza degli Imperatori e Patriarchi bizantini (VI–VII Sec.)* (Louvain).
- Maier, Jean-Louis (1973), *L'épiscopat de l'Afrique romaine, vandale et byzantine* (Rome).
- Mandouze, André (1982), *Prosopographie de l'Afrique chrétienne (303–533)* (Paris).
- Mango, Cyril (1985), 'Deux études sur Byzance et la Perse Sassanide', *Travaux et Mémoires* 9: 91–117.





- Mansi. See *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*.
- Markus, R.A. (1981), 'Gregory the Great's Europe', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5th ser. 31: 21–36.
- (1997), *Gregory the Great and his World* (Cambridge).
- Markus, Robert A. and Claire Sotinel (2007), 'Introduction', in Chazelle and Cubitt (2007) 1–14.
- Martyn, John (2004), *The Letters of Gregory the Great*, 3 vols (Toronto).
- Maspero, Jean (1923), *Histoire des patriarches d'Alexandrie* (Paris).
- Millar, Fergus (2010), 'Rome's "Arab" Allies in Late Antiquity: Conceptions and Representations from within the Frontiers of the Empire', in H. Börm and J. Wiesehöfer, eds, *Commutatio et contentio: Studies in the Late Roman, Sasanian, and Early Islamic Near East* (Düsseldorf) 199–226.
- Möller, W. and G. Krüger (1903), 'Monotheleiten', in *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3rd edition (Leipzig) vol. 13, 410–3.
- Murphy, Francis Xavier, and Polycarp Sherwood (1973), *Constantinople II et III* (Paris).
- Neil, Bronwen (2006a), *Seventh-Century Popes and Martyrs: The Political Hagiography of Anastasius Bibliothecarius* (Turnhout).
- (2006b), 'Commemorating Pope Martin I: his Trial in Constantinople', *StPat* 39: 77–82.
- (2010), 'From *Tristia* to *Gaudia*: The Exile and Martyrdom of Pope Martin I', in J. Leemans, ed., *Martyrdom and Persecution in Late Antique Christianity: Festschrift Boudewijn Dehandschutter* (Leuven) 179–94.
- Noble, Thomas F.X. (1984), *The Republic of St. Peter The Birth of the Papal State, 680–825* (Philadelphia PA).
- (1995), 'Rome in the Seventh Century', in Michael Lapidge, ed., *Archbishop Theodore* (Cambridge) 68–87.
- (2001), 'The Intellectual Culture of the Early Medieval Papacy', *Settimane di Studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull'alto medioevo* 48, 2 vols (Spoleto) I, 179–213.
- (2009), *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians* (Philadelphia).
- Nordhagen, Per Jonas (1962), 'The Earliest Decorations in Santa Maria Antiqua and their Date', *Acta ad archaeologiam et artium historiam pertinentia* 1: 53–72.
- (1979), 'S. Maria Antiqua: the Frescoes of the Seventh Century', *Acta ad archaeologiam et artium historiam pertinentia* 8: 89–142.
- Noret, Jacques (1999), 'La redaction de la *Disputatio cum Pyrrho* (CPG 7698) de saint Maxime le Confesseur serait-elle postérieure à 655?', *Anal. Boll.* 117: 291–6.
- Ohme, Heinz (2006), 'Motive und Strukturen des Schismas im monenergetisch-monothelischen Streit', *AHC* 38: 265–96.
- (2008a), '*Oikonomia* im monenergetisch-monothelischen Streit', *ZAC* 12: 308–43.





- (2008b), 'Die Bedeutung der ökumenischen Konzile in der Sicht Martin Luthers', *AHC* 40: 195–212.
- Olster, David (1994), *Roman Defeat, Christian Response and the Literary Construction of the Jew* (Philadelphia PA).
- Osborne, John, J. Rasmus Brandt and Giuseppe Morganti, eds (2004), *Santa Maria Antiqua al Foro Romano centi anni dopo*, Atti del colloquio internazionale Roma 5–6 maggio 2000 (Rome).
- Paramelle, J. (1996), 'Morceau égaré du *Corpus dionysiacum* ou pseudo-pseudo Denys? Fragment d'une *Lettre à Tite* inconnue', in Y. de Andia, ed., *Denys l'Aréopagite et sa postérité en Orient et en Occident* (Paris) 235–66.
- Peeters, P. (1933), 'Une Vie grecque du pape S. Martin I', *Anal. Boll.* 51: 225–62.
- Peitz, W.M. (1917) 'Martin I. und Maximus Confessor: Beiträge zur Geschichte des Monotheletenstreit in den Jahren 645–668', *Historisches Jahrbuch* 38: 213–36.
- Pietri, Charles (1976), *Roma Christiana Recherches sur l'Eglise de Rome, son organization, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311–440)*, 2 vols (Rome).
- Pietri Charles *et al.* (2000), *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, 2: *Prosopographie de l'Italie chrétienne (313–604)* (Rome).
- Pollard, R.M. (2009), 'The decline of the *cursus* in the papal chancery', *Studi Medievali* 50: 1–40.
- Pontal, Odette (1989), *Histoire des conciles mérovingiens* (Paris).
- Price, Richard (2009), *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople 553*, 2 vols (Liverpool).
- (2010a), 'Monotheletism: A Heresy or a Form of Words?', *StPat* 46: 221–32.
- (2010b), 'Aspects of the Composition of the Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649', *AHC* 42.1: 51–8.
- (2011), 'The Voice of Christ in the Psalms', in A. Andreopoulos *et al.*, eds, *Meditations of the Heart: The Psalms in Christian Thought and Practice* (Turnhout 2011) 1–14.
- Price, Richard and Michael Gaddis (2005), *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, 3 vols (Liverpool).
- Price, Richard and Mary Whitby, eds (2009), *Chalcedon in Context: Church Councils 400–700* (Liverpool).
- Quasten, Johannes (1960), *Patrology*, vol. 3, *The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature, from the Council of Nicaea to the Council of Chalcedon* (Westminster MD).
- Rammelt, Claudia (2008), *Ibas von Edessa: Rekonstruktion einer Biographie und dogmatischen Position zwischen den Fronten* (Berlin).
- Rapp, Claudia (2004), 'All in the Family: John the Almsgiver, Nicetas and Heraclius', *Nea Rhome. Rivista di ricerche bizantinistiche* 1: 121–34.
- Richard, Marcel (1966), 'Une faux dithélite: Le traité de S. Irénée au diacre Démétrius', in P. Wirth, ed., *Polychronion, Festschrift F. Dölger* (Heidelberg) 431–40.





448 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

- Richards, Jeffrey (1979), *The Popes and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages, 476–752* (London).
- Richardson Jr., Lawrence (1992), *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore Maryland).
- Riedinger, Rudolf (1976), 'Aus der Akten der Lateran-Synode von 649', *ByZ* 69: 17–38 = Riedinger (1998) 3–24.
- (1977), 'Griechische Konzilsakten auf dem Wege ins lateinische Mittelalter', *AHC* 9: 253–301 = Riedinger (1998) 43–91.
- (1980), 'Zwei Briefe aus den Akten der Lateransynode von 649', *JÖB* 29: 37–59 = Riedinger (1998) 95–117.
- (1981), 'Sprachschichten in der lateinischen Übersetzung der Lateranakten von 649', *ZKG* 92: 180–203 = Riedinger (1998) 137–60.
- (1982a), 'Die Lateransynode von 649 und Maximus der Bekenner', in *Maximus Confessor: Actes du Symposium sur Maxime le Confesseur, Freiburg/Schweiz 2.-5. September* (Freiburg), 111–21 = Riedinger (1998) 169–79.
- (1982b), 'Die Epistula Synodica des Sophronios von Jerusalem im Codex Parisinus BN Graecus 1115', *Byzantiaka* 2: 143–54.
- (1984), 'Die Nachkommen der Epistula Synodica des Sophronios von Jerusalem (c.634)', *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 26: 91–106.
- (1985), 'Die Lateranakten von 649, ein Werk der Byzantiner um Maximus Homologetes', *Byzantina* 13: 519–34 = Riedinger (1998) 223–38.
- (1992), 'In welcher Richtung wurden die Akten der Lateransynode von 649 übersetzt, und in welcher Schrift war die lateinische Text dieser Akten geschrieben?', in *Martino I Papa (649–53) e il suo tempo. Atti del XXVIII Convegno storico dell'Accademia Tudertina e del Centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale (Todi, 1991)* (Spoleto), 149–64 = Riedinger (1998) 283–98.
- (1994), 'Die lateinischen Übersetzungen der Epistula encyclica Papst Martin I (CPG 9404) und der Epistula synodica des Sophronios von Jerusalem (CPG 7635)', *FilMed* 1: 45–69 = Riedinger (1998) 301–25.
- (1996), 'Wer hat den Brief Papst Martins I. an Amandus verfaßt?', *FilMed* 3: 95–104 = Riedinger (1998) 329–38.
- (1998), *Kleine Schriften zu den Konzilsakten des 7. Jahrhunderts*, Instrumenta Patristica 34 (Turnhout).
- Riou, Alain (1973), *Le Monde et l'Église selon Maxime le Confesseur* (Paris).
- Rizou-Couroupos, S. (1987), 'Un nouveau fragment de la *keleusis* d'Héraclius au pape Jean IV', in J. Drummer, ed., *Texte und Textkritik* (Berlin) 531–2.
- Roosen, B. (2010), 'Maximi Confessoris Vitae et Passiones Graecae: The development of a hagiographic dossier', *Byzantion* 80: 408–61.
- Roueché, Charlotte (2009), 'Acclamations at the Council of Chalcedon', in Price and Whitby (2009) 169–77.
- Rubery, Eileen (2011), 'Papal opposition to imperial heresies: Text as image in the Church of Sta. Maria Antiqua in the Time of Pope Martin (649–54/5)', *StPat* 50: 3–29.





- (2012), 'Conflict or Collusion? Pope Martin (649–654/5) and the Exarch Olympius in Rome after the Lateran synod', *StPat* 52: 339–74.
- Rushforth, G. McN. (1902), 'The Church of S. Maria Antiqua', *PBSR* 1: 1–123.
- Russell, Norman (2004), *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition* (Oxford).
- Sahas, Daniel J. (2003), 'The demonizing force of the Arab conquests: The case of Maximus (ca 580–662) as a political "confessor"', *JÖB* 53: 97–116.
- Sako, L.R.M. (1983), *Lettre christologique du Patriarche Syro-Oriental Išō'yahb de Gdālā (628–46): étude, traduction et édition critique* (Rome).
- Sánchez Valencia, R. (2003), 'The Monophysite Conviction in the East versus Byzantium's Political Convenience: A Historical Look to Monotheletism in Palestine', *Aram* 15: 151–7.
- Sansterre J.-M. (1983), *Les moines grecques et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne (milieu du VI^e s. – fin du IX^e s.)*, *Académie Royale de Belgique, Memoires de la classe des lettres*, ser. 2, 66.1, 2 vols (Brussels).
- Schacht, J. (1936), 'Der Briefwechsel zwischen Kaiser und Papst von 641/2 in arabischer Überlieferung', in *Orientalia* n.s. 5: 235–46.
- Schatz, Klaus (1992), *La Primauté du Pape Son Histoire des origines à nos jours* (Paris).
- Schneider, A.M. (1951), 'Sankt Euphemia und das Konzil von Chalkedon', in A. Grillmeier and H. Bacht, eds, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon: Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 3 vols (Würzburg) I: 291–302.
- Schönborn, Christoph von (1972), *Sophrone de Jérusalem: Vie Monastique et Confession Dogmatique* (Paris).
- (1975), 'La primauté romaine vue d'Orient pendant la querelle du monoenergisme et du monothélisme (VII^e siècle)', *Istina* 20: 476–90.
- Sherwood, Polycarp (1952), *An Annotated Date-List of the Works of Maximus the Confessor* (Rome).
- Sieben, Hermann Josef (1979), *Die Konzilsidee der Alten Kirche* (Paderborn).
- Siecienski, A. Edward (2010), *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (Oxford).
- Sotinel, Claire (2007), 'The Three Chapters and the Transformations of Italy', in Chazelle and Cubitt (2007) 85–120.
- Souter, Alexander (1949), *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D.* (Oxford).
- Stead, Christopher (1994), *Philosophy in Christian Antiquity* (Cambridge).
- Stoyanov, Yuri (2011), *Defenders and Enemies of the True Cross: The Sasanian Conquest of Jerusalem in 614 and Byzantine Ideology of Anti-Persian Warfare* (Vienna).
- Stratos, Andreas (1968–78), *Byzantium in the Seventh Century*, 5 vols (Amsterdam).
- (1976), 'The Exarch Olympius and the supposed Arab invasion of Sicily in A.D. 652', *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 25: 63–73, reprinted in his *Studies in 7th-Century History* (London, 1983) X.
- Thacker, Alan (2013), 'Rome the pilgrims' city in the seventh century', in F. Tinti,





450 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

- ed., *England and Rome in the Early Middle Age: Pilgrimage, Art and Politics* (Turnhout).
- Thanner, Anton (1989), *Papst Honorius I. (625–638)* (St Ottilien).
- Thiel (1868). See *Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae*.
- Thümmel, H.G. (2005), *Die Konzilien zur Bilderfrage im 8. und 9. Jahrhunderte. Das 7. Ökumenische Konzil in Nikaia 787* (Paderborn).
- (2008), 'Zur Phänomenologie von Konzilien. Das 6. Ökumenische Konzil 680/1', *AHC* 40: 85–98.
- Thunberg, Lars (1965), *Microcosm and Mediator: The Theological Anthropology of Maximus the Confessor* (Uppsala).
- Torrance, I.R. (1988), *Christology after Chalcedon: Severus of Antioch and Sergius the Monophysite* (Norwich).
- Treadgold, Warren (1990), 'A Note on Byzantium's Year of the Four Emperors', *BZ* 83: 431–3.
- Usener, H. (1907), *Der Heilige Tychon* (Leipzig and Berlin).
- Uthemann, Karl-Heinz (1997), 'Ber Neuchalkedonismus als Vorbereitung des Monotheletismus: Ein Betrag zum eigentlichen Anliegen des Neuchalkedonismus', *StPat* 29: 373–413 = id. (2005) 207–55.
- (2005), *Christus, Kosmos, Diatribe: Themen der frühen Kirche als Beiträge zu einer historischen Theologie* (Berlin).
- Valentini, R. and G. Zucchetti, eds (1940–53), *Codice Topografico della città di Roma*, 4 vols (Rome).
- Van Dieten, J.L. (1972), *Geschichte der Patriarchen von Sergios I. bis Johannes VI. (610–715)* (Amsterdam).
- Van Roey, Albert and Pauline Allen (1994), *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century* (Leuven).
- Vries, Wilhelm de (1974), *Orient et Occident: Les structures ecclésiales vues dans l'histoire des sept premiers conciles oecuméniques* (Paris).
- Wessel, Susan (2001), 'Literary Forgery and the Monothelete Controversy: Some Scrupulous Uses of Deception', *GRBS* 42: 201–20.
- Westeel, Isabelle (1999), 'Quelques remarques sur la Vita Eligii, Vie de Saint Eloi', *Mélanges de science religieuse* 56: 33–47.
- Wickham, Chris (1981), *Early Medieval Italy Central Power and Local Society 400–1000* (London).
- Winkelmann, Friedhelm (2001), *Der monenergetisch-monotheletische Streit* (Frankfurt am Main).
- Wolska-Conus, Wanda (1989), 'Stéphanos d'Athènes et Stéphanos d'Alexandrie. Essai d'identification et de biographie', *REB* 47: 5–89.
- Wood, Ian (1994), *The Merovingian Kingdoms 450–751* (Harlow).
- (2001), *The Missionary Life Saints and the Evangelisation of Europe 400–1050* (Harlow).
- (2007), 'The Franks and Papal Theology 550–660', in Chazelle and Cubitt (2007) 223–41.





BIBLIOGRAPHY

451

- (2013), 'Between Rome and Jarrow: Papal relations with Francia and England, from 597 to 716', *Settimana di studio* 61 (Spoleto).
- (2014), 'Between Rome and Jarrow: Papal Relations with Francia and England from 597 to 716', *Settimane di Studio del Centro italiano di Studi sull'alto medioevo* (Spoleto).
- Woods, David (2007), 'Adomnán, Arculf, and the True Cross: Overlooked Evidence for the Visit of the Emperor Heraclius to Jerusalem c. 630?' *ARAM* 19: 403–13.
- Young, Frances (2010), *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to the Literature and its Background*, 2nd edition (London).
- Zanini, Enrico (1998), *Le Italie byzantine territorio, insediamenti ed economia nella provincia byzantine d'Italia (VI–VIII secolo)* (Bari).
- Zuckerman, Constantin (2002a), 'La haute hiérarchie militaire en Afrique byzantine', *Antiquité tardive* 10: 169–75.
- (2002b) 'Heraclius in 625', *RÉB* 60: 189–97.





INDICES

1. DOCUMENTS AND CITATIONS IN THE ACTS

- Ambrose, *De fide* (CPL 150) 172–5
(1–4), 306–8 (1–5), 316 (2), 318
(6), 333 (2)
——, *De spiritu sancto* (CPL 151)
308–9 (6–7)
——, *Exposition of Luke* (CPL 143)
317–9 (3–5,7)
Amphilochius of Iconium, *On 'Non
potest filius'* (CPG 3245.10) 315
(6–7)
——, *On 'Pater maior me est'* (CPG
3241) 340 (24)
Anastasius of Antioch, *Defence of
Leo's Tome* (CPG 6952) 343
(35)
Apollinarius, *Contra Diodorum* (CPG
3356) 348 (2)
——, *De fide et incarnatione* (CPG
3647) 348 (3)
——, *Demonstratio* (CPG 3652) 348
(4,7)
——, *In dei in carne manifesta-
tionem* (CPG 3653) 348 (5–6),
360 (5)
Athanasius, *Contra Arianos* (CPG
2093) 338 (14–15)
——, *On 'Nunc anima mea'* (CPG
2161) 324 (18–19)
——, *On 'Qui dixerit verbum'* (CPG
2096) 339 (17–19)
[Ps.-] Athanasius, *Ad Iovinianum*
(CPG 2253) 213
——, *Adversus Apollinarium* 324 (17)
——, *De incarnatione contra
Apollinarium* (CPG 2231) 338
(16)
——, *De incarnatione et contra
Arianos* (CPG 2806) 323 (15)
——, *Sermo maior de fide* (CPG
2803) 323 (16)
Augustine, *City of God* (CPL 313) 320
(9–10)
——, *Contra sermonem Arianorum*
(CPL 702) 175 (5)
——, *Enarrationes in psalmos* (CPL
283) 319 (8), 321 (11)
——, *ep. 140 to Honoratus* (CPL 262)
176 (6), 321 (12)
——, *Opus imperfectum contra
Iulianum* (CPL 326) 365–6
——, *Tractatus in Iohannem* (CPL
278) 309 (8)
Basil of Caesarea, *De gratiarum
actione* (CPG 2848) 210 (3)
——, *De spiritu sancto* (CPG 2839)
119, 310 (13), 314 (1)
——, *ep. 236 to Amphilochius* (CPG
2900) 339 (20)
——, *In Ps. 1* (CPG 2836) 310 (14)
[Ps.-] Basil, *Adversus Eunomium*
(CPG 2837) 119, 309 (9–12)
Byzacena, Bishops of, *Petition to
Constans IV* 166–9





- Chalcedon, Definition of 210 (4),
271–3, 281–2, 284
- Colluthus, Defence of Theodosius’
Tome (CPG 7298) 219, 354
(28–32)
- Columbus of Numidia and others,
Letter to Pope Theodore 161–4
- Constantinople, Council of (553), Acts
and Canons 273–8, 280, 304–5
- Constantinople, Creed of 268
- Constantinople, Synods of (638–9),
Acts 231–4, 249
- Cyril of Alexandria, *Comm. on
Hebrews* (CPG 5209.3) 342 (30)
- , *Comm. on John* (CPG 5208)
311–2 (21–4), 315 (9), 332 (41–4)
- , *Comm. on Matthew* (CPG 5206)
315 (8), 331 (38–40), 370
- , *Defence of the 12 Chapters*
(CPG 5222) 259, 365, 367–8
- , *Dialogues on the Trinity* (CPG
5216) 119, 313 (34), 315 (10), 365
- , *Thesaurus* (CPG 5215) 119,
312–3 (25–33), 330 (36–7), 342–3
(31–2), 369, 372
- , *ep. 39, to John of Antioch* (CPG
5339) 212
- , *ep. 46, Letter 2 to Succensus*
(CPG 5346) 217
- , Twelve Chapters (CPG 5317) 209
(1), 269–71
- [Ps.-] Cyril of Jerusalem, sermon (CPG
3590) 341 (26–7)
- Cyrus of Alexandria, letters to Sergius
of Constantinople (CPG 7610–2)
235–6, 250, 283
- , *Plerophoria [Pact of Union]*
(CPG 7613) 118, 212–3, 247–8,
360 (5)
- [Ps.-] Dionysius, *On the divine names*
(CPG 6602) 124, 209 (2), 222,
336 (8)
- , *ep. 4 to Gaius* (CPG 6607) 210
(2), 216–8, 221, 224, 336 (9)
- Ekthesis* 118–9, 122, 127–8, 226–30,
248–9, 283–4, 357, 360 (3,4),
361, 382, 402–3, 414–5
- Ephraem of Antioch, *Contra Severum*
(CPG 6903) 343 (33)
- Epiphanius, *Panarion* (CPG 3745)
328–9 (31–3), 341 (25)
- Felix III, Pope, Letter to Acacius 185
- Greek monks, Letter to the synod
151–6
- Gregory Nazianzen, *ep.* (CPG 3032)
101 to Cledonius 209 (1), 374
- , *ep. 102 to Cledonius* 282
- , *ep. 203 to Nectarius* 251
- , *oratio 30, On the Son* (CPG
3010) 258, 314 (2), 324–5
(20–21), 358, 366
- , *oratio 39, On the holy lights*
(CPG 3010) 227, 373
- Gregory of Nyssa, *Ad Ablabium
quod non sint tres dei* (CPG
3139) 310 (19)
- , *Ad Eustathium de sancta
trinitate* (CPG 3137) 310
(15–18)
- , *Antirrheticus adversus
Apollinarium* (CPG 3144) 314
(3–4), 326 (26)
- , *Contra Eunomium* (CPG 3135)
315 (5), 340 (21, 23)
- , *De beatitudinibus* (CPG 3161)
340 (22)
- , *De oratione dominica* (CPG
3160) 311 (20)
- , *De tridui spatium* (CPG 3175)
325–6 (23–5)
- , *Refutatio Eunomii* (CPG 3136)
325 (22)





454 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

- Hilary, *De trinitate* (CPL 433) 333
(1)
[Ps.-] Hippolytus, *Contra Beronem*
(CPG 1916) 316 (1)
——, *In sanctum pascha* (CPG 4611)
323 (14)
- Ibas, Letter to Mari the Persian (CPG
6500) 356 (9)
- John Chrysostom, *De consubstantiali*
(CPG 4320) 326 (27)
——, *De vidua* (CPG 4495.2) 341 (28)
——, *Homilies on John* (CPG 4425)
327 (28)
[Ps.-] John Chrysostom, *In S. Thomam*
(CPG 4574) 342 (29)
John of Scythopolis, *Contra Severum*
(CPG 6850) 343 (34)
Julian of Halicarnassus, *Contra*
Manichaeos (CPG 7127) 355
(33)
[Ps.-] Justin, *Expositio rectae fidei*
(CPG 6218) 337 (10–13)
- Leo, Pope, *Tome* (*ep.* 28) (CPL 1656)
120–1, 158, 185, 214, 223, 284,
333 (3)
——, *Second Tome* (*ep.* 165) (CPL
1656) 120, 322 (13), 334–6
(4–7)
Lucius of Alexandria, *In pascha*
(CPG 2535) 348 (1)
- Martin, Pope, Encyclical Letter,
398–408
——, Letter to Amandus of Maestricht
408–12
——, Letter to Constans II 412–17
Maurus of Ravenna, Letter to Pope
Martin 126–8
Maximus the Confessor, *Disputation*
with Pyrrhus 122
- Nestorius, Letter to Alexander of
Hierapolis (CPG 5675) 356 (5)
[Ps.-] Nestorius, *Manifest Initiation*
(CPG 5757) 355–6 (3–4)
Nicene Creed 268
- Paul of Constantinople, Letter to Pope
Theodore 254–60, 358–60
Paul the Persian, *De iudicio* (CPG
7014) 356 (6)
Polemon, *Antirrheticus* (CPG 3710)
350 (8), 359 (2)
——, Sixth Letter to Timothy (CPG
3712) 350 (9), 359 (1–2)
Proconsularis, Bishops of, Letter to
Paul of Constantinople 170–80
Pyrrhus of Constantinople, Letter to
Pope John (CPG 7616) 358, 359
(2)
——, *Tome* (CPG 7617) 224, 248
- Sergius of Constantinople, *ep.* 2 to
Cyrus of Alexandria (CPG
7605) 118, 213–6, 248, 360 (5)
Sergius of Cyprus, Letter to Pope
Theodore 157–60
Severian of Gabala, sermons 329
(34–5)
Severus of Antioch, excerpts 350–1
(10–15), 360 (4)
Stephen of Dor, Letter to the synod
142–9
- Themistius of Alexandria, excerpts
(CPG 7286–92) 219, 352–4
(18–27), 359–60 (3)
Theodore of Mopsuestia, *De*
incarnatione (CPG 3856) 355
(2)
[Ps.-] Theodore of Mopsuestia, *De*
miraculis 355 (1)
Theodore of Pharan, excerpts (CPG
7601–2) 204–6, 209–10





INDICES

455

- Theodoret: see Ps.-Justin
Theodosius of Alexandria, *Tome to Theodora* (CPG 7133) 351–2 (16–17)
Theodulus the Nestorian, *De consonantia* (CPG 6540) 356 (7–8)
Theophilus of Alexandria, sermons 327–8 (29–30)
Typos 123, 147, 153, 262–3, 402–3, 414–5
Victor of Carthage, Letter to Pope Theodore 182–6

2. PERSONS IN THE ACTS

The attendance lists are omitted, since they reproduce the subscription list at the end of Session V.

- Adeodatus of Abbir (Proconsularis) 178 (27)
Adeodatus of Ameria (Umbria) 386 (42)
Adeodatus of Spoletum (Umbria) 385 (33)
Albinus of Portus (Tuscia) 386 (57)
Albinus of Signia (Campania) 387 (74)
Amabilis of Ostia (Tuscia) 234, 386 (56)
Anastasius of Narnia (Umbria) 387 (82)
Anastasius companion of Maximus the Confessor 156 (35)
Anastasius regional notary 142, 212, 226, 305
Andrew of Ydruntum (Calabria) 386 (69)
Aquilinus of Assisium (Umbria) 386 (62)
Arcadius of Cyprus 159
Augustalis of Abitinae (Proconsularis) 177 (15)
Augustine of Squillacium (Bruttii) 387 (75)
Barbatus of Cumae (Campania) 387 (77)
Barbatus of Sutrium (Tuscia) 385 (20)
Bassus of Carpi (Proconsularis) 178 (26)
Beatus Laurentius Tarasus of Usula (Byzacena) 169 (28)
Beatus Stephanus Spisindeo of Quaeastorianensis (Byzacena) 169 (26)
Benaclus of Hermiane (Byzacena) 169 (41)
Benedict of Ajaccio (Corsica) 210, 252, 385 (8)
Benenatus of Curubis (Proconsularis) 180 (67)
Benenatus of Giutrambacariensis (Proconsularis) 180 (58)
Benenatus of Naraggara (Proconsularis) 180 (65)
Benenatus of Simitthu (Proconsularis) 178 (24)
Boethius of [Forum] Cornelia (Flaminia) 387 (93)
Boniface of Justiniana Maximianensis (Byzacena) 169 (30)
Boniface of Puppianensis (Proconsularis) 179 (38)
Boniface of Sassura (Byzacena) 169 (39)
Boniface of Telensis (Proconsularis) 178 (21)





456 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

- Bonitus of Ferentia (Tuscia) 386 (44)
Bonitus of Ferentum Polymartium
(Tuscia) 386 (50)
Bonitus of Formiae (Campania) 385
(14)
Bonosus of Aleria (Corsica) 387 (91)
Bonus of Ficuculae (Flaminia) 386 (47)
- Callionistus of Hatria (Samnium) 387
(98)
Calumniosus of Halaesa (Sicily) 385
(21)
Candidus of Dices (Byzacena) 168 (9)
Candidus of Sicca (Proconsularis) 179
(53)
Carosus of Falerii (Tuscia) 385 (18)
Clarissimus of Thabraca
(Proconsularis) 179 (49)
Columbus of Numidia 161, 164
Constantine of Aeliae (Byzacena) 168
(18)
Constantine of Althiburus
(Proconsularis) 179 (50)
Constantine of Tabbora (Proconsularis)
177 (7)
Crescens of Thuburnica
(Proconsularis) 177 (17)
Crescentinus of Leptis Minus
(Byzacena) 168 (12)
Crescentius of [Forum] Livii
(Flaminia) 387 (96)
Crescentius of Locri (Bruttii) 385 (24)
Crescis of Cefalensis (Proconsularis)
177 (14)
Cresciturus of Bossa (Proconsularis)
179 (43)
Cresconius of Uccula (Proconsularis)
179 (52)
Cyprian of Tadduensis (Proconsularis)
178 (25)
Cyprian of Villa Magna
(Proconsularis) 180 (62)
Cyriacus (Byzacena) 169 (31)
- Cyril of Alexandria 259, 367–72
Cyrus of Alexandria 118, 224, 282–3,
381
- Datianus of Turris Blanda (Byzacena)
167 (3)
Decoratus of Tibur (Campania) 386
(55)
Deusdedit of Cagliari (metropolis of
Sardinia) 130, 156, 223, 260, 367,
384 (3), 417
Deusdedit presbyter of Ravenna 126,
128, 160, 385 (4), 417
Dominic of Absassallensis
(Proconsularis) 179 (36)
Donatianus of Numluli (Proconsularis)
179 (48)
Donatus of Hippo Diarrhytus
(Proconsularis) 177 (11)
Donatus of Horrea (Proconsularis) 180
(54)
Donatus of Limisa (Byzacena) 168 (15)
Donatus of Mariana (Corsica) 387 (90)
Donatus of Sassina (Picenum) 387
(102)
Donatus of Unizibirensis (Byzacena)
168 (24)
- Epiphanius of Albanum (Campania)
385 (7)
Eusebius of Atella (Campania) 386 (63)
Eustathius, general 235
Evasius of Vicus Ateri (Byzacena) 168
(14)
Exsuperius regional notary 157, 170,
219, 235, 306
- Felix of Aborensis (Proconsularis) 178
(33)
Felix of Agrigentum (Sicily) 385 (25)
Felix of Panormus (Sicily) 386 (71)
Felix of Pariensis (Proconsularis) 177
(8)





INDICES

457

- Felix of Segermes (Byzacena) 169 (37)
Felix of Terracina (Campania) 387 (78)
Felix of Thenae (Byzacena) 169 (33)
Felix of Timida (Proconsularis) 178 (22)
Felix of Trisepel (Proconsularis) 180 (57)
Firminus of Blera (Tuscia) 387 (80)
Flavian of Utica (Proconsularis) 180 (66)
Florentius of Egugensis (Proconsularis) 177 (10)
Florentius of Senta (Proconsularis) 180 (55)
Fortis of Agensis (Proconsularis) 180 (68)
Fortunatus of Auximum (Picenum) 386 (48)
Fortunius of Ofitana (Proconsularis) 179 (41)
Fortunius of Zella (Byzacena) 168 (11)
Fructuosus of Vina (Proconsularis) 178 (23)

Gaudiosus of Capua (Campania) 386 (43)
Gaudiosus of Reate (Valeria) 386 (35)
Geminianus of Volaterrae (Tuscia) 385 (27)
Gentilis of Clibdensis (Proconsularis) 177 (16)
George hegumen in Rome 151, 154 (4)
Germanus of Numana (Picenum) 385 (16)
Germanus of Thuburbo (Proconsularis) 179 (40)
Gloriosus of Camerinum (Umbria) 386 (54)
Gratiosus of Nepet (Tuscia) 387 (86)
Gulosus of Pupput (Proconsularis) 170, 177 (1)

Helias of Lilybaeum (Sicily) 386 (61)
Heraclius, Emperor 223, 226, 381, 410

Isaacius exarch of Italy 235

Januarius of Bahanna (Byzacena) 169 (32)
Januarius of Gatianensis (Byzacena) 168 (6)
Januarius of Libertinensis (Proconsularis) 178 (31)
Januarius of Musti (Proconsularis) 179 (45)
John of Carinae (Sicily) 387 (73)
John of Cilibia (Proconsularis) 178 (20)
John of Gabopolis (Palestine) 387 (105)
John of Mibiarcensis (Byzacena) 167 (4)
John of Milan (Liguria) 388 (107)
John of Paestum (Lucania) 385 (34)
John of Regium (Bruttii) 387 (76)
John of Tarentum (Calabria) 386 (40)
John of Tropeia (Bruttii) 386 (37)
John of the Unnogours 387 (103)
John of Vicosabinae (Valeria) 387 (99)
John hegumen of St Sabas' (Palestine) 150, 154 (1)
Jovian of Firmum (Picenum) 387 (81)
Julian of Duae Selemselae (Proconsularis) 179 (47)
Julian of Horta (Tuscia) 385 (9)
Julian of Ruspae (Byzacena) 168 (22)
Justin of Cagliari (metropolis of Sardinia) 388 (108)
Justus of Tauromenium (Sicily) 386 (70)
Juventinus of Stabiae (Campania) 386 (65)

Laetus of Luca (Tuscia) 386 (67)
Laurence of Perusium (Tuscia) 385 (17)





458 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

- Laurence of Tauriana (Bruttii) 386 (36)
Laurence of Tuder (Umbria) 386 (72)
Leontius of Faventia (Flaminia) 387 (101)
Leontius of Naples (Campania) 304, 387 (87)
Lucian of Leontium (Sicily) 385 (12)
Lucian of Succubensis (Proconsularis) 179 (51)
Luminosus of Bononia (Aemilia) 387 (95)
Luminosus of the Marsi (Valeria) 386 (53)
Luminosus of Salernum (Campania) 386 (38)
Luminosus of Tifernum Tiberinum (Umbria) 385 (29)

Majorianus of Palestrina (Campania) 385 (15)
Malliodorus of Dortona (Liguria) 388 (109)
Marcellinus of Clusium (Tuscia) 385 (26)
Marcellus of Mattianensis (Proconsularis) 177 (3)
Marcianus of Mevania (Umbria) 385 (19)
Marinianus of Populonia (Tuscia) 385 (28)
Martin, Pope *passim*
Martin of Centumcellae (Tuscia) 386 (64)
Martin of Gabii (Campania) 385 (32)
Maurosus of Ancona (Picenum) 386 (46)
Maurus of Cesena (Flaminia) 126, 160, 385 (4), 417
Maurus of Ravenna (Flaminia) 126–9, 385 (4)
Maurus of Senae (Tuscia) 386 (66)
Maurus of Senegallica (Picenum) 386 (45)
Maurus of Tuscana (Tuscia) 385 (31)
Maximus of Aquileia (metropolis of Venetia and Histria) 128, 151, 180, 278, 361, 384 (2)
Maximus of Misenum (Campania) 387 (85)
Maximus of Pisaurum (Picenum) 385 (11)
Maximus of Rucuma (Proconsularis) 178 (18)
Maximus of Sua (Proconsularis) 179 (46)
Maximus of Trecalae (Sicily) 386 (51)
Maximus the Confessor 155 (34)
Mellosus of Bulla Regia (Proconsularis) 180 (61), 184
Mellosus of Gisipensis (Proconsularis) 177 (6), 184
Mustulus of Cabarsussi (Byzacena) 169 (27)

Navigius of Thigimna (Proconsularis) 180 (63)
Nepus (Byzacena) 169 (36)
Nestorius of Constantinople 229
Numidius of Sofiana Junci (Byzacena) 169 (40)

Oportunus of Anagnia (Campania) 387 (79)
Oportunus of Pisae (Tuscia) 387 (89)
Optatus of Autenti (Byzacena) 168 (17)

Palumbus of Fundi (Campania) 386 (58)
Papinius of Vibo (Bruttii) 385 (10)
Pariator of Hiltensis (Proconsularis) 177 (4)
Pariator of Scillium (Proconsularis) 178 (34)
Paschalis of Blanda [Julia] (Lucania) 386 (52)





INDICES

459

- Paschalis of Thermae [Himeriae]
(Sicily) 387 (88)
- Paschalis regional notary 128, 166,
182, 217, 254, 268
- Paschasius of Decorianensis
(Byzacena) 168 (21)
- Paul of Constantinople 123, 253–4,
265–6, 381
- Paul of Thibica (Proconsularis) 177 (9)
- Pentadius of Turris Tamalleni
(Byzacena) 169 (38)
- Peregrinus of Lipara (Sicily) 387 (92)
- Peregrinus of Messana (Sicily) 385 (22)
- Peter of Culusitana (Proconsularis)
178 (30)
- Potentinus of Velitrae (Campania) 385
(30)
- Potentius of Pola (Histria) 387 (100)
- Probus of Thacia Montana
(Proconsularis) 170, 177 (2)
- Pyrrhus of Constantinople 123, 165,
224, 381
- Quintus of Achulla (Byzacena) 169
(34)
- Quobulus of Caeciritana
(Proconsularis) 180 (56)
- Redemptus of Canapius
(Proconsularis) 179 (42)
- Redemptus of Neapolis (Proconsularis)
178 (32)
- Reparatus of Manturia (Tuscia), 385
(5)
- Reparatus of Mauretania 161, 164
- Reparatus of Megalopolis
(Proconsularis) 179 (44)
- Restitutus of Jubaltiana (Byzacena)
168 (10)
- Rodibaldus of Valentinianensis
(Byzacena) 169 (42)
- Romanus of Cerillae (Bruttii) 385
(23)
- Romulus of Thiges (Byzacena) 168 (8)
- Rufinus of Sipontum (Apulia) 386 (41)
- Sabbatius of Buxentum (Lucania) 386
(39)
- Sallustius of Febianensis (Byzacena)
168 (23)
- Sapientius of Nomentum (Campania)
387 (84)
- Saturninus of Marazana (Byzacena)
167 (5)
- Scholasticus of Fanum (Picenum) 386
(60)
- Secundus of Tagenensis (Byzacena)
167 (2)
- Sergius of Constantinople 118–9, 122,
218, 231–2, 235, 249–50, 381
- Sergius of Joppa (Palestine) 148
- Sergius of Tempsa (Bruttii) 203, 216,
385 (5)
- Severinus, Pope 235
- Sigebert III king of Austrasia 411
- Sophronius of Jerusalem 144–5
- Spes of Crepudulensis (Byzacena) 169
(35)
- Stephen of Byzacena 161, 164, 166,
167 (1)
- Stephen of Clypea (Proconsularis) 180
(59)
- Stephen of Dora (Palestine) 142, 149,
387 (104)
- Stephen of Forum Popilii (Flaminia)
387 (97)
- Stephen of Gummi (Byzacena) 169
(29)
- Stephen of Taraquensis (Byzacena)
168 (18)
- Stephen of Thelepte (Byzacena) 168
(13)
- Stephen of Thuccabor (Proconsularis)
179 (37)
- Stephen *syncellus* of Constantinople
231





460 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

- | | |
|---|---|
| Thalassius hegumen in Rome 150, 155 (2) | Tripolius of Uchi Maius (Proconsularis) 180 (64) |
| Themistius deacon of Alexandria 220, 381 | Valentinian of Bisica (Proconsularis) 179 (39) |
| Theodore, Pope 148 | Valentinus of Thurii (Bruttii) 387 (94) |
| Theodore of Biltha (Proconsularis) 177 (5) | Valerius of Thubursicu (Proconsularis) 177 (12) |
| Theodore of Hirina (Byzacena) 168 (25) | Venerius of Thysdrus (Byzacena) 168 (7) |
| Theodore of Pharan (Palestine) 203, 206–11, 381 | Viator of Ortona (Samnium) 385 (13) |
| Theodore of Rosellae (Tuscia) 386 (68) | Victor of Bulnensis (Proconsularis) 178 (35) |
| Theodore of Tamazeni (Byzacena) 168 (16) | Victor of Carthage (metropolis of Proconsularis) 182, 186 |
| Theodore of Tyndaris (Sicily) 387 (83) | Victor of Membressa (Proconsularis) 178 (28) |
| Theodore hegumen of St Sabas' (Africa) 150, 155 (3) | Victor of Thucca (Proconsularis) 178 (19) |
| Theodore regional notary 151, 161, 182, 204, 231, 262, 347 | Victorianus of Uzalis (Proconsularis) 387 (106) |
| Theodore from Tarsus 155 (28) | Victorinus of Abziritana (Proconsularis) 180 (60) |
| Theodosius of Croton (Bruttii) 386 (59) | Victorinus of Temunianensis (Byzacena) 168 (20) |
| Theophylact <i>primicerius</i> of notaries 115, 142, 150, 157, 161, 165, 181–2, 204, 211, 216, 219, 226, 230–1, 234, 254, 261, 268, 304, 306, 347 | Vitalis of Thizica (Proconsularis) 178 (29) |
| Thomas of Lunae (Tuscia) 386 (49) | Vitalis of Zarnensis (Proconsularis) 177 (13) |

3. THE COMMENTARY

- | | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| Acts of 649 | African church |
| canons 300–1 | letters from 133–5, 138–9 |
| role of Roman clergy 62–4, 246, 389–90 | synods (646) 135 |
| copies circulated 77–9, 394–6 | Amandus of Maestricht 79, 392–3 |
| editing 67–8 | Arab invasions, impact 22, 25, 56 |
| florilegia 287–96 | Augustine in the florilegia 319–22 |
| Greek and Latin versions 59–64 | |





INDICES

461

- Chalcedonian fundamentalism 2–3,
56–7
- Constans II, Emperor 13, 25, 78, 81–5,
393
- Constantinople, synods (638–9)
198–9
- Cyprus, Council of (636) 10–11
- Cyrus of Alexandria 8, 193
- Deusdedit of Cagliari 74
- Dionysius the Areopagite 192–5
- Dyothelitism in the tradition 291–2
- ‘Economy’ over doctrine 20–21, 31
- Ekthesis* 11, 22–4, 196–9
- Florilegia, development 287
- Francia, response to the synod 79–81
- Gregory, African exarch 15–16, 38
- Gregory the Great, Pope 43–4
- Gregory Nazianzen 297–8
- Gregory of Nyssa 292
- Haethfelth, Synod of 103
- Heraclius, Emperor 19, 32
and church reunion 7–9, 20–22
- Honorius, Pope 45–9, 241
- John IV, Pope 48–50
- Lateran Synod of 649
attendance 69–72, 418–22
co-chairmen 116
course 73–7
encyclical 389–91
procedure 64–8
reception 103–8
status 67
theology 99–100
- Lateran Synod of 680 103–4
- Leo I, Pope, Tome of 240–2
- Lombards 42, 50–51, 70, 422
- Martin, Pope 54, 73–83
Greek letters 78, 393–7
- Maurus of Ravenna 74–5, 113
- Maximus the Confessor 12–15, 32–8,
83–6
influence on Acts of 649 62,
99–100, 112, 286–90, 297–9,
364, 379, 413
on monoenergism 28–30
on monotheletism 12, 24, 35–6
rehabilitation 105–8
on Roman primacy 36–7
on wills in Christ 96–9
- Milo of St Amand 79, 393
- Monoenergism 87–90
origin of 19–21
- Monotheletism 92–9, 242–4
origin of 22–4
- Notaries, Roman 72, 431
- Olympius exarch in Italy 81–2
- Operations in Christ 87–90, 292–3
- Papacy
jurisdiction 41–2
primacy 36–7, 57, 76
- Paul of Constantinople 26, 53, 96,
238–9
- Paul of Thessalonica 71, 396
- Psephos* 9–10, 21–2
- Pyrrhus of Constantinople 14–16, 50,
53, 198–9
- Riedinger, R. x, 61–4, 133–4, 390–1,
393–4
- Rome
clergy 55, 62–4, 246, 389–90
Greek monks in 39, 75, 136–8
Santa Maria Antiqua 80–1
- Sergius of Constantinople 5, 9, 21, 46,
193–9, 241





462 THE ACTS OF THE LATERAN SYNOD OF 649

Severinus, Pope 12, 48, 235
Sophronius of Jerusalem 9–10, 27–35
 On monoenergism 9–11
Stephen of Dora 135–6, 138
 papal legate in the east 54, 397
 at synod of 649 72

Theodore, Pope 14–17, 51–4
Theodore of Pharan 191–2

Theodore of Tarsus 75, 103
Theophylact, chief notary 72
Traditionalism, doctrinal 301,
 383
Typos 16, 239, 244

Vitalian, Pope 81, 86

Will(s) in Christ 90–102, 296–9

